

The  
**American Historical Review**

THE HISTORICAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA

THAT the people of the United States are fond of history is shown by their eagerness to make it, rather than by any habit of turning to the past as furnishing precedents for guidance in times of uncertainty or peril. We are at this moment engaged in an exciting episode of a contest already centuries old; we feel the liveliest interest in the details of the historical drama going on before our eyes; and we understand the importance of keeping an accurate record of the deeds of our popular heroes. We not only require detailed information as to what they say and do in moments of crisis and peril, but we insist on exact statements of what they would have done had circumstances been otherwise, what they declined to do, what they eat and drink or refuse to partake of, how they are clad and how they prepare themselves for a plunge into the sea under an enemy's guns. The events now passing are like the meteorological observations of Arctic travellers or the cases before a crowded court; they accumulate faster than we can dispose of them; and it will require a generation of historical writers to sift the crude materials and to work out the story of our own times.

Side by side with this fierce interest in the events of the day is a disregard, almost an ignorance, of the past history of America. At the end of a quiet and uneventful decade, the nation has suddenly awakened to the possibility of a new career; but it seems disposed to look on the war, its causes and its results, as sudden and unexpected; as something to be met and settled with due reference to the conditions of the end of the nineteenth century, but with an impatient ignoring of the slow development of a Spanish question in the four hundred years which have rolled away since America was discovered. There has been a passionate appeal to principles of for-

eign intercourse laid down by Washington and Jefferson and Monroe—and but little reference to the historical progress of the Cuban question as shown in almost every volume of our national records. We work over again, in foreign relations as in financial affairs, things which might be supposed to have been settled by the experience of a century. We cheerfully send arms and suggest organization to the Cubans, without troubling ourselves to remember how little aid and comfort we have had from insurgent allies in Canada, in Tripoli, in California, in New Mexico and in Samoa.

Yet the Americans are one of the most conservative of all peoples, and our whole political system rests on a respect for precedent. Without knowing the details of the Spanish-American domination the nation has somehow a consciousness that it has grown to be intolerable. If there be a fault, it is not that of the makers of history, but of the historians, who have failed to set clearly before their countrymen the course of our diplomatic policy; and of historical teachers, who have not imbued their students or pupils with the sense of the sequence of historical events.

Three years ago, in the opening number of the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, a writer discussed the attitude of democracy toward the spirit of historical inquiry. Later experience shows no reason for abandoning his conclusions: the great American democracy both makes and records history; and gains in accuracy of vision from decade to decade. At the beginning of the fourth volume of the *REVIEW* it may be worth while to enter on a humbler inquiry—to see how far public bodies, individuals and societies are performing their task of collecting, preserving and opening up historical materials; what is now doing by American historical scholars to put into systematic form the details of our national history; how far writers are striving to tell the consecutive story of our national life; and what unused opportunities there are for transmitting the knowledge of our memorable past and uplifting present. The field is broad, the material enormous, the workers many, organizations powerful and increasing. What is doing and what may well be done for historical science in America?

Too little attention has so far been paid to the geographical and topographical side of American history; and a prime duty of Americans is the preservation and marking of our historical sites. In foreign cities not only are famous houses carefully preserved, such as Dürer's in Nuremberg and the Plantins' in Antwerp, but memorial tablets everywhere abound. In America some of the stateliest and most memorable buildings have been



sacrificed, like the Hancock mansion in Boston ; but at present the tendency is to preserve really handsome public and private edifices ; and good people everywhere give money and time to keep these causes of civic pride before the eyes of their countrymen. The great incitement to this virtuous work was doubtless the purchase of Mount Vernon by the Ladies' Association, in the fifties, for which purpose Edward Everett coined his silver voice into golden eagles. Among hundreds of instances may be mentioned the restoration of the old Philadelphia city buildings, including Independence Hall ; the keeping up the old church at Williamsburg, Va. ; the establishment of the Rufus Putnam house at Rutland as a place of pilgrimage ; and the repair of Californian convent buildings. Many private owners acknowledge that the historical houses which they inhabit are subject to a kind of public use, like Madison's seat at Montpelier ; and some even busy themselves in working out the history of their habitation, and of the famous people who have entered its portals, as has been done by the present owner and occupant of the Craigie House in Cambridge.

By this time the principles which ought to govern the use of an historic building are widely recognized : it should be restored so far as possible to its condition at the time of its greatest historical importance—Carpenter's Hall as it was when the Continental Congress occupied it, and Monticello as Jefferson knew it. It should be called to the attention of the wayfarer by a suitable, permanent tablet of stone or brass ; if possible, it should be kept up as a public monument or at least freely opened to public view. It must be admitted that, though most of the buildings of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries which are still preserved have a dignity and beauty which makes them worth keeping as works of art, the nineteenth-century cradles of civil government in the West are not inspiring pieces of architecture, even in the few cases where they have not long ago been replaced. We do not realize that our ancestors went through the same process as ourselves, that they also had to build and rebuild, before they left the comely court-houses and quaint churches and stately dwellings which we now admire.

Even if the building be worthless or destroyed, the site may fitly be commemorated by a permanent inscription. We moderns are so overwhelmed with reading matter that we do not fully understand the effect of inscriptions which stand in public view—the literature of the bookless ; yet the noble sentences on the new Congressional Library will be read longer and will have greater influence than any contribution to the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*. There is a

citizen of Massachusetts who takes special delight in leading his English visitors to a stone in Arlington which reads :

Near this spot  
Samuel Whittemore  
Then 80 years old  
Killed three British soldiers  
April 19, 1775  
He was shot, bayoneted  
Beaten and left for dead,  
But recovered and lived  
To be 98 years of age.

However repellent to the British may be the toughness of able-bodied Samuel, the inscription does bring home strongly the force and passion of that April day when, as Sir Edward Thornton pithily stated it, "Englishmen now know that you were fighting our battles." The route from Boston to Concord is designated all the way by memorial stones ; and there are many historical marches of the Revolution and the Civil War which deserve like attention.

Tablets upon public buildings or within them are too little regarded in this country, though senseless decorations are not uncommon. For instance, the state house of Connecticut, one of the few beautiful and individual capitols, which might well bear tribute to the founders of the first written constitution of an American commonwealth, is embellished with "a charm" of two thousand tarnished buttons. Compare with this barbaric gewgaw the arms of the pedestals which hang on the walls of the court of one of the public palaces at Florence. At the University of Padua the spacious "aula," the stone stairways, and the courts, are adorned with hundreds of coats of arms of noble students ; compare this historical monument with the bare walls of the buildings of an ancient seat of learning in Massachusetts, the authorities of which refused to permit a list of distinguished occupants of an eighteenth-century dormitory to be placed upon its walls, because it made distinctions. In the effort to preserve sets of portraits of governors of states and mayors of cities the public recognizes the desire to keep men once honored in the minds of other men. Shall our elder worthies plead in vain before a matter-of-fact generation, "Lord, keep my memory green" ?

The time to mark the sites of buildings and the scenes of notable events, the time to note the houses and the rooms once occupied by famous men, is the present, while they can be identified. Many are already lost or disappearing. Who knows where Governor Berkeley roared with official fury ? Who marks the college rooms of James Madison, of John Adams or Daniel Web-

ster? A line of white stones in the pavement of the Place de la Republique preserves the outlines of the Bastile; but who stops in his passage through Cincinnati streets to guess the site of Fort Washington? Most of the important battle-fields of the Civil War have been well marked, in the life-time of men who participated; but who has visited or could trace Pigwacket or Camden or Tippecanoe or Resaca de la Palma?

Another service to history and to patriotism would be to catalogue in each state and city the memorable historical sites, with such brief notes as may reveal their significance to the hasty searcher. There are guide-books to Plymouth, possibly to Providence, New Haven or Charleston; but how shall a visitor know the many historical treasures in the out-of-the-way towns of New Hampshire or South Carolina or Kentucky? To record and to catalogue is a necessary task, congenial to the much-abused antiquary, without whom our forefathers would be to us only myths.

Some time a pathway will be blazed for the pilgrim to his country's monuments all the way from Acadia to California; meanwhile something may be done to make the closet historian (if there be any such in this age of realities) acquainted with the appearance of the scenes he describes. The lantern-slide has become an agent of civilization: we ascend the Pyramids on its convenient ray; we traverse Arctic solitudes; we see voiceless guns belching shells at an enemy—may we not also let the lantern be our guide to far-away buildings and battle-fields? Might not those "other people who have nothing to do" get together collections of slides, illustrating their own neighborhood or state? And might not such slides be catalogued and sold in sets, or borrowed and lent, and thus made a part of historical instruction?

Who is to do this work of identification, of marking sites, or providing the necessary monuments, of preparing photographs and slides? In many places the state or local government will take up the task if properly inspired; and indeed most municipalities are pleased to find that they have spots worth marking. In other cases the work must be done by private societies, whose sole function shall be historical; for though Sons and Daughters of Historical Periods have their usefulness, they do not often promote exact historical work. Among special societies formed to rescue historical sites the first is the admirable Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities, which is now doing the work of examining, listing and preserving the memorials of its ancient commonwealth. One of its services is to bring people who have money and good will, but no especial knowledge of the treasures in their neighbor-

hood, into relation with things that need to be done, with such results as the embanking of the remnants of Jamestown Island. Another typical organization is the Harvard Memorial Society, which exists only to search out and mark sites memorable in the history of that university.

Of "monuments" in the narrower sense the country has too many and too few: too many of the type of that marvel of useless stone-cutting, the Soldiers' Monument in Cleveland, forced upon an unwilling city by an artless state legislature; too few like the Shaw Monument in Boston, a really individual and inspiring work of art, which could be set up only for the one man whom it commemorates, and yet through him speaks of the heroism of armies, and raises the moral standard of every man who sees it. Let towns and cities remember Hawthorne's injunction: "The man who needs a monument should never have one."

For the historian the buildings of our ancestors are a lesson and an illustration, but he cares especially for official records of events. The thirteen colonial legislatures, the active town-meetings in New England and the county courts in the South, have furnished a large number of separate records; but, notwithstanding local pride and the pressure of genealogy-hunters, we have nothing approaching complete printed records of a single colony. Many states have worked at the task for years, notably Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and North Carolina, but the results in most cases are confused or fragmentary. For instance the Massachusetts "resolves" of the provincial period have not been all collected, because the editor could not bring himself to publish simply the texts, but insisted on sending them out to the world embellished with valuable notes. The legislature lost patience after twenty-eight years of publication, which had included only eighty-nine years of statutes and sixteen of resolves, and suspended the whole enterprise. No better field for enlightened lobbying could be found than in persuading legislatures to print their own colonial or early state records, as simply and as expeditiously as is possible, while making accurate transcripts; posterity may be relied upon to furnish the *scholia*.

Local records have been notoriously neglected, and on the whole very few have been printed in full. Boston, Providence, Worcester, Southampton (Long Island) and now New Amsterdam have published the fullest sets. Here again is a field for the friend of history, and the lover of quaint literary extracts. For instance, when you read of the town of Lee that in 1779 its discontented

citizens voted that they held themselves "bound to support the Civil Authority of the State for the term of one year," you are tempted to possess a copy of the whole record of that town. The thing is not so difficult as it seems; local newspapers will often gladly publish successive installments of the records, and allow the type to be rearranged in pages for a more permanent publication.

The archives of the states since the end of the Revolution are in a deplorable condition: the records are in many cases badly stored, very few of them are calendared; and in many instances they are almost unknown even to their custodians. When an investigator wishes information out of such collections he can find little if he searches for himself, and he has still less likelihood of getting information by correspondence. To meet this difficulty a plan of co-operation has been suggested; it provides for a kind of interstate board made up of one person from the neighborhood of each state capital, or large city, who should make it his business to learn the ins and outs of the archives, and should select competent searchers and copyists. To such a person the seeker after truth might apply with the certainty that he was dealing with some one who understands his needs and could put him in the way of information and of hiring proper transcribers. The labor required of each of these unofficial archivists would be small; the service to historical study would be great.

In some respects the national archives are in better shape than those of the states; and they contain large masses of material of the utmost importance. In general the custodians of United States documents show much patience and courtesy, but they are too few and too much occupied to do what they would like for the visiting scholar; and in many fields of great importance reasons of state forbid a close search. For instance, the Confederate archives deposited in the War Department have been opened to very few scholars, because of the relation of those papers to claims on the government. The recent appointment of a trained historical scholar as head of the Department of Manuscripts in the Congressional Library is a step which promises to make available much buried material. But even such an official must expect sooner or later to meet the elastic obstinacy which recently defeated a head of a bureau in one of the Departments at Washington, who was armed with unlimited authority from his Secretary to search the records for certain historical material; he found that nothing could overcome the obstinate determination of the custodian, that nobody should invade his documents.

The first necessity with regard to the government archives is to calendar the great series of manuscript material for use *in situ*; the

next step is to enter on a scientific publication of certain classes of that material. The proper beginning would be a new critically prepared edition of the *Journals of Congress* from 1775 to 1788; for while selected parts of these journals were printed at the time, and have since been reprinted, and omitted parts were later published separately as the *Secret Journals*, neither set is very accurate. Another prime necessity is a critical edition of the Ordinances of Congress having the force of permanent law, from 1775 to 1788; it is hard to see how the federal courts have got on without such an official publication. Then might well follow selections from the manuscript Reports of Committees and other congressional papers of Revolutionary times. The next step should be the publication of new national editions of the works of the great American statesmen, from the large collection of manuscripts in the archives of Washington, supplemented by other sets held elsewhere. It hardly seems suitable that the Washington, Jefferson and Monroe papers, the property of the government, should contain material known to the public only through very expensive limited editions of private publication. We are grateful for the enterprise which makes such material available in any form; we should be more grateful if the government would itself issue in generous and scholarly editions the works of the great statesmen.

So far as kindly Uncle Sam is concerned there is little hope for an enlightened publication or calendaring of the invaluable materials which he owns, except under powerful organized pressure. Many members of Congress are alive to the importance of opening up the government store-houses, but they must perforce feel the greatest zeal in such matters as constituents press upon them. What is needed is a persistent and widely-diffused understanding of and insistence on the value of these records and the importance of publishing them. Now that the Civil War series is nearing completion, and now that people appreciate the necessity of permanent records of the Spanish war, perhaps the attention of Congress may again be fixed on the records of the Revolution and of the formative period of our government.

What once goes into public archives usually stays there till somebody makes it available; and official custodians presumably at least intend to protect their charge from the dangers to which papers are always exposed—fire, damp, insects and animals, the ravaging autograph-pirate and ignorant destruction. Private manuscripts and rarities have no such traditional protection and are perishing every day. A few perfectly authenticated incidents will show



how little the public realizes the value of written material, even from the collections of public men. Recently some children in Barnstable, Massachusetts—a prosperous and intelligent town—were seen making a bonfire of papers, which had been taken out of a stable-loft or some such receptacle. The holocaust was stopped in time to save about a barrel of documents, which proved to be valuable correspondence of 1765 on the Stamp Act. Upon the death, within fifteen years, of a well-known public man of Missouri—member of Congress during an important period of our national history—his family presented his library of books to a college of the state. The professor of history, knowing that he possessed a unique collection of pamphlets, hastened to ask for them also, but found that all the pamphlets had been burned, “for of course they were of no value.” A son of a most distinguished American statesman was applied to for information about one of the rarest of Americana, rightly supposed to be in his deceased father’s library, and in surly fashion refused to make search for it; but he afterward found it and violently attacked the searcher for saying truthfully that the document had been “inaccessible.”

The pursuit of the papers of the late Chief Justice Chase has in it the materials for one of the veracious law-reports of the late Sherlock Holmes. Mr. Chase was a man who perfectly understood the importance of preserving his papers, who kept careful journals and letter-books, and filed all important letters addressed to him. Here, if anywhere, the path of the investigator ought to be smooth. But the search, begun less than twenty years after the jurist’s death, revealed the fact that, through no fault of his family, all these papers had utterly disappeared, and could not be found after patient search in four different cities. One volume of the journals, containing the account of the Cabinet discussion on the Proclamation of Emancipation, was by an accident discovered in the hands of a kinsman, to whom it had been given by a third party, neither of them dreaming of its importance. The letters had reposed for nearly twenty years in the vaults of a trust company, from which they were extracted only by the persistence of a distinguished American historian, who must have greeted them as did Poggio Bracciolini the manuscript of Quintilian in the tower of St. Gall: “I verily believe that if we had not come to the rescue, he must speedily have perished. He was indeed right sad to look upon and ragged, like a condemned criminal, with rough head and matted hair, protesting by his countenance and garb against the injustice of his sentence.” The diaries turned up in the hands of an old friend of Mr. Chase in a distant state, and at his decease would

probably have been unknown but for the chance finding of a letter of inquiry among the dead man's letters. Important letter-books are still absolutely missing, as well as scrap-books and other illustrative material. It required literally years to resuscitate a part of the papers once so carefully preserved.

How is the public to be educated up to an understanding of the value of historical material? Now and then a collection is rescued from loss or scattering as were the three thousand Jefferson documents recently presented by a descendant of the great Democrat to the Massachusetts Historical Society; but material is perishing every day for lack of intelligent interest in the deeds of our fathers or the memorials of their deeds. One longs for the Mohammedan superstition against destroying the smallest scrap of paper, lest it have written upon it the name of God.

The principal agency for the preservation of papers is the historical societies, whose function will be considered below; but there are several other means of arousing public interest. One is, to set the public schools at work; and a conspicuous example of success is the town of Brookline, Mass., where the pupils of the high school have identified historical sites, have used the unpublished local records, and have even printed some results of their modest investigations. Where there is no such wealth of interesting material as in Brookline, teachers may at least make it a part of their instruction in American history to call the attention of children to the value of manuscript materials, and to encourage their bringing into class for exhibition such interesting letters and papers as they may find in their own family possessions. Sometimes unsuspected treasures will be brought to light, as in the quiet Ohio family in which the head bethought himself of an old land-warrant, which proved to bear a remarkable autograph of President Andrew Jackson.

Local and state commissions, officially appointed, may be very helpful in smelling out forgotten manuscripts; and Massachusetts and Rhode Island have established such commissions, so as to put pressure on the town authorities to preserve their records. Should the interstate archive commission suggested above ever be created, the resident member in each state might eventually become practically such a public conscience himself—with or without official appointment; or he might move public sentiment toward the organization of a record commission.

Manifestly, however, the most effective work in these lines is to be done by a permanent national commission. Since none has ever been created by the government, the American Historical Association in 1895 provided for a body of five persons to be known as

The Historical Manuscripts Commission; and the first volume of the results of their work has appeared in the annual report of the Association for 1896, as a government publication. The energy of the commission is shown not only by this valuable volume, but by its obtaining the right to use the long secluded John C. Calhoun papers, which are to appear in a new volume of the reports. Interest and aid in the work of that commission have been widely secured; what it now needs is the co-operation of local and state societies and the use of more funds than the \$500 a year generously voted it by the American Historical Association. The Manuscripts Commission is now at work searching for records of a century or half a century ago; in due time their labors should so affect public sentiment that fifty years hence the historian may find the documents of our own period carefully kept and intelligently opened to his study.

The preservation of historical material will help future writers, but another of the duties of historical students is to work out results. Until about thirty years ago most of the conscious historical writing in this country was either put into elaborate works or into solid articles in periodicals; the monograph was little known. Two influences have since led to keen and intelligent monographic work in the United States: foreign example and the opportunity of publishing in series.

When Charles Kendall Adams in Michigan and Henry Adams in Massachusetts began about the same time in the seventies to introduce the "seminar method" of historical study, they made their students acquainted with the painstaking research in very limited fields which characterizes the German "doctor's dissertations," and they encouraged like study and publication by their students. Then came the influence of the *Johns Hopkins Studies*, the first systematic collection of such detailed work in America. Some brief historical monographs have also been published from time to time in the periodicals of political science, economics and sociology, and several of the universities have now entered on the issue of formal series of monographs on subjects in American history and government, besides the many individual ventures.

The quality of much of this work is high, and many young American scholars are thus preparing the way for future historians. In several respects, however, monographs are less effective than they ought to be. The first defect is duplication, due to the fact that there is no convenient way of finding out either what has been done or what is being done in the subject which the student may

select ; hence he may discover at the end of his labors that his work is superceded before it is ready. It would greatly serve "the cause" if monograph material, including the more elaborate articles in periodicals, were somehow kept catalogued, so that investigators might learn where to look for light and beginners might know what to avoid. Already the professors of American history in some of the large universities have been induced to combine in preparing an annual co-operative list of the doctor's theses now under way.

Another defect is the slowness with which the most serious and startling gulfs are filled. No subject in American constitutional history is so important as the congressional system of government ; yet it is only within three years that we have had any systematic account of either the Committee System, the Senate or the Speaker of the House. We have still absolutely no detailed account of the Confederate States of America or of Spanish diplomacy with the United States. There is no monograph on presidential removals from office, or the Seminole war, or President Grant's relations with the Cuban imbroglio. If some historian of weight would only print his list of desiderata, many aspirants for historical reputation would be amazed at the vast amount which remains to be done.

The more important results of monographic work seem readily to find publishers ; but there is a body of shorter or more abstruse works for which there is no regular medium. The American Historical Association has sometimes published such work in its *Papers* or *Annual Report*—for instance, the recent elaborate account of *Proposed Amendments to the Federal Constitution* ; and many painstaking pieces of work find refuge in little-read publications of local societies ; but the country needs to furnish some kind of opportunity for really scholarly works on American history, which are too brief or too detailed for commercial publication. At present recourse in such cases must ordinarily be had to the writer's pocket, or to the publication fund of his university.

A means of stimulating scientific work in history, very familiar in other countries, is the offering of prizes. Many of the colleges have special prize funds ; but competition is usually limited to students of that institution. Mr. John C. Ropes has recently set an example of reform by offering a prize for brief monographs in subjects drawn from Napoleon's career, open to students of several universities. What is now needed, however, is an annual national prize, or series of prizes, offered in such a way as to make success a distinguished honor, so that an award may help a man's whole career. The money value ought to be enough to make it an object, and the circumstances of the award such as to bring the suc-

cessful contestant's name and work to the knowledge of those interested in history throughout the country.

One of the fundamental needs of American history is a proper general history of the United States, and the ambitious youth can set before himself no task more important or more difficult. Besides the old-fashioned historians like Bartlett and George Tucker, few writers have essayed the task of setting forth the complete history of their country except in brief and ordinarily juiceless text-books. Bancroft spent fifty years in his attempt to "write a history down to his own time" and stopped fifty years back of the date when he first entered on his labors. The next generation of writers, Parkman, Henry Adams, McMaster, Rhodes, Schouler and the rest, have chosen limited fields. Fame, large royalties and national gratitude will be the meed of him who in two or three compact volumes will set forth a scholarly and yet interesting history of the things that have really told in the life of the nation.

Till this new historian come, furnished with the accuracy of Hildreth, the breadth of view of Bancroft, and the style of Parkman, we may perhaps reach the same end by the co-operative method. To fit together the work of many writers in right perspective is always difficult, and in a brief work almost impossible. Justin Winsor's mighty *Narrative and Critical History* is a kind of pudding-stone in which the boulders furnished by the writers are set in a matrix of the editor's learning, which circumfuses and permeates the whole mass. A supplementary volume, covering the last hundred years of our history, would be a boon to historical students; but where is there another master-mind like Winsor's? Nevertheless it is worth considering whether the right kind of combined effort might not enlist six or eight specialists in making a National History of the United States, under the auspices of some acknowledged authority.

Besides a general history we need several careful studies of special phases of American history. First of all we lack a constitutional history of the colonial period, in which the variations of English institutions under the conditions of a new life shall be set forth, and the principle of "the survival of the fittest" shall be applied to our present systems of government. We need quite as much a constitutional history of the Revolution which shall discover the real causes of that great division in the English race, and, at the same time, shall clear up the transition from colonial to state and national government. The germs of our present federal system are to be found in the period from 1775 to 1778; and yet none of the general histories of the period really describes either the state or the national governments of that time; and we have only scattered

monographic work. The history of slavery is also still to be written: Von Holst has taken up the political side; but there is room for a dispassionate account of what slavery actually was on the plantation and in the mansion, and how it affected the lives of white men and women. The constitutional side of the Civil War is also to be studied as yet only in brief articles or chapters; we do not know the whole story of the vicissitudes of the constitution in that epoch.

There is a like paucity of the right kind of books on industrial and social life in America. We know what political principles the colonists strove for better than we know what were their moral and business standards. The kinks in the reasoning of our forefathers on such subjects as smuggling, piracy, the slave-trade, and Indian neighbors, are still a puzzle to their descendants. Did the Puritan clergy crack jokes after the Thursday lecture? Did the Pennsylvania German trader water the rum intended for white people? Was the slave-dealer a respected citizen in Georgia? Did the merchant systematically pay his debts to the English manufacturer? Such questions and others more important can be answered only after much delving in colonial archives, much expenditure of gray matter and much wear on modern pens, typewriters and typesetting machines. Land and land-tenure is perhaps the most difficult subject of historical research; yet we really know more about the "hide" and "free and common socage" than about the granting, survey, recording, transfer, quitrents and taxation of colonial land, or the occupation of the West in the early part of our own century. Above all we have no systematic account of the chief concern of millions of our forefathers—their religion. Many are the histories of American churches; nowhere is there an account of religion as a vital, formative force in colonial and federal history. What we need to know about our ancestors, whether English, colonial, or nineteenth-century, is, what did they think was right and wrong in private and public affairs? To give us the means of answering that question is one of the best opportunities open to the coming historian.

Perhaps we cannot expect much further advance in secondary writing till we have better means of reaching the sources and the secondary works already in existence. A boon to every man interested in his country's history would be a discriminating bibliography. To say nothing of the existing single volumes of selected titles, more or less classified, there have been three attempts at American bibliography on a large scale. Sabin's *Dictionary of American Bibliography* has suffered from the same causes as the French Academy's *Dictionnaire*: it attempts a task almost impos-



sible; for in thirty years it has come down only to the letter S. Eventually the rest of the alphabet and a topical index are promised; but at best only a few libraries and individuals are likely to own nearly thirty volumes of a single bibliography. Winsor's *Narrative and Critical History* has become as much an essential for the historical student as Bradford's *History*, or the *Annals of Congress*, or *Niles's Register*; but it leaves almost untitled the Congressional period. Mr. Iles's new enterprise of making up a list of a thousand titles, each with a critical note by an expert, is a step in the right direction on the only feasible method: a limited work, carried through by co-operation.

Neither of these three works fills the place of a scientific yet handy bibliographical manual for the historical student, or would be superseded by such a manual. Here, if anywhere, is opportunity for skillful combination of the labor of many persons. What more suitable task for some historical organization with roots widespread than to enter on the preparation of a bibliography which might include, say ten thousand titles, classified by subjects, and each provided with a note setting forth its value? It is significant that Mr. Iles's plan for a similar work on a smaller scale has proceeded from the libraries and not from the historians. Certainly if a work like Leypoldt's *American Catalogue* goes out of print, and is picked up eagerly at seventy-five dollars a set, such a bibliography as has just been suggested would find nearly all the libraries and historical societies in the country among its purchasers, and would need no charitable support. And a system of annual or continuous indexes of new material, in pamphlets or on printed cards, would put a new tool into the hand of every student.

A good bibliography would not only be bought by libraries, it would help to create them; for it should include lists of historical books in successive, concentric rayons—"the best 50 volumes;" "the best 100 volumes;" "the best 200 volumes," and so on. The formation of collections of historical books, both on American and on foreign topics, is one of the duties which never should be forgotten, for it is the service of the craft to the country. Such collections as those of the Boston Public Library, the Lenox Library, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, the John Carter Brown Library in Providence, the Burton Library in Detroit are the delight of the investigator; but they are already formed, and are permanent. The task is now to encourage the little town libraries to buy historical books and make them available, and to see to it that city and college libraries have full sets of standard sources, of secondary works and of periodicals.

More than that, this is the time to sweep up local and transient publications, and put them where the next generation will find them safe. Professor Willard Fiske had the pleasure of discovering a literature in his famous collection of books in the Romansch dialects; he got that unique collection together by himself calling from house to house in the Engadine, and bearing away with him all the books that the peasants would sell. The "source method" might be applied in the schools of many country towns in America if they would preserve their valuable material; we want the dusty piles of books out of the garrets; we want the papers in the rubbish heaps in the cellars. It was only the other day that a wayfarer found in a refuse heap near his country home in New Hampshire a perfect map of Cheshire County—now almost impossible to buy; perhaps by digging deeper he might have found Belknap's *History of New Hampshire*, or even an autograph letter of Governor Wentworth. Transient publications, pamphlets, fugitive reports—what the Germans graphically call *Flugschriften*—these are the worry of the tidy housekeeper, and the prize of the local library.

Newspapers too ought to be carefully sought and deposited in libraries. To be sure we may look forward to the time when the whole of Manhattan Island will be required for the storage of the files of the metropolitan Sunday newspapers; but even at that time libraries will still be vainly trying to pick up an odd volume of the *Aurora*, or *Rivington's Gazette*, or *Niles's Register*, or the *Liberator*, to complete sets—a volume which is to-day going to light fires. The good sense of the editors of the *New Jersey Archives* has suggested to them the value of an index which will give a clue to the whereabouts of the most important colonial newspapers, and they have already published several parts of their invaluable key to the colonial issues. The same service might well be performed for the newspapers and rare periodicals down to 1861, and for Confederate newspapers during the Civil War. The need of the day is not more newspapers but some way to find those already published and to get at their contents.

Some of the services of newspapers have been performed by periodicals of various kinds. The *North American Review* from 1815 to 1870 abounded in serious historical articles, and the great illustrated monthlies of the present generation have much valuable material, both sources and secondary; but one of the plainest duties of Americans is to keep up some periodicals expressly devoted to the subject of history. Some such have existed and then ceased to be. Such are Dawson's *Historical Magazine* issued from 1857 to 1875, and the *Magazine of American History* issued from 1877 to

1894. One reason for the discontinuance of these serviceable journals was that they were exclusively American. During the last quarter-century a new spirit has crept into the minds of students of their country's history: they see that it is not a subject disconnected from the general development of the world's history; they appreciate the interest and importance of other fields; they desire the aid of other men who are not so fortunate as to confine their attention to America. Hence all the historical periodicals founded in the last fifteen years have distinctly announced that they deal with foreign as well as American conditions and events.

Taking history in a large sense, as including economic, social and governmental development, there are now in the United States seven special periodicals of which the sole aim is to record and instruct in that field. In this classification no offence is intended to the votaries of Political Science, who consider that their specialty enfolds history, or to the sociologists who hold that sociology includes all other human sciences, although nothing with which they disagree is true sociology. The seven journals are, then: the (Columbia) *Political Science Quarterly*; the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (conducted chiefly by professors of the University of Pennsylvania); the *Yale Review*; the (Chicago) *Journal of Political Economy*; the (Harvard) *Quarterly Journal of Economics*; the (Chicago) *American Journal of Sociology*; and the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW. Although in every case contributions are solicited and received from scholars all over the country, all but one of these journals is a satellite, or rather a double star to some one institution of learning.

That the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW is founded on a basis of general co-operation is due to the self-abnegation of several universities which might have started periodicals of their own, but preferred to join forces with others. Whatever the result of this co-operative system, it seems to the editors the only way of founding a journal which shall presume to be representative of the great body of historical scholars and teachers in America. There are moments when it seems reasonable to hope that by and by other journals will divest themselves of their local character and join their energies in national periodicals; there is even a vision of four quarterlies, so timed that one of them shall come out each month, and covering the four fields of Political Science, Economics, Sociology and History, respectively. The main difficulty in such a fusion of interests is how to arrange for such control and support of the various organs as shall make them all permanent, and genuinely national in spirit and direction.

Since history is not only a pursuit for the learned but a study familiar in schools of every grade, the question of methods of teaching has come to be serious both for historians and for educators. Probably no branch of learning has been habitually worse taught in America: methods of parrot repetition of stale text-book phrases have crept all the way up from the district school to the university. Even the notion of reading standard historical works as collateral to the text-books found a lodgment in the minds of college professors only about thirty years ago. To improve the teaching of history in schools, we must look, as a preliminary, to a more enlightened public opinion on the preservation and use of materials.

At present most of the well-known writers of history in America are either teachers of the subject or at least lecturers to college students; hence, there is a kind of pedagogical turn to much of the discussion in historical assemblages. College teaching has steadily improved under the influence of men themselves trained where history was properly taught—either at home or abroad; and history in colleges may now be trusted to care for itself. It is otherwise with teaching in schools, which is often of a character to justify the confused school-boy who once recorded for the writer's information that "The greatest men of Carthage were Hamilcar and Hannibal Hamlin;" or the other ingenious youth who said more than he was aware of when he asserted that "the Social War was fought in Bacteria."

To raise the schools out of the slough three influences have been at work: that of teachers who wanted to teach something; that of college authorities who framed entrance examinations in history; and that of historical investigators who saw the absurdities of the rote system. These influences converged in the first attempt to give national currency to ideas of reform, the Report of the Madison Conference on History and Government, made to the Committee of Ten in 1893. A second general conference was held at Columbia in 1896, made up of representatives of six universities and six secondary schools. It framed a new scheme of entrance requirements in history which laid emphasis on collateral reading and written work, and asked for recognition by the colleges of a good and extended school course in history. The scheme thus recommended has already been substantially adopted by Cornell, the University of Pennsylvania, Tufts, Wellesley, and Harvard. A third discussion of the subject has been that of the Committee of Seven, appointed by the American Historical Association in 1896, now engaged in the work of drafting school-programmes which will meet proper college re-

quirements, and expected to report to the Association in December, 1898. The outlook for a great increase of interest and efficiency in school history is therefore encouraging; and the necessary specialist teachers are now being trained in the universities and colleges throughout the land. New text-books of much merit have also been produced, most of them by men who are experts in the subjects which they discuss; and collateral reading has been made available in great variety. The result must be an intelligent interest throughout the country in historical records and historical writing.

The historical opportunity in the United States is appreciated; to carry the good work farther a proper organization of scattered forces is necessary. The natural centres of activity are the local historical societies; but there seems to be something in the nature of history which causes such associations to ebb, before they have reached high tide. To carry them on successfully, it is essential to develop intelligent, trained and interested directors, both men and women. Here is a career ready for some of those graduates of women's colleges, whose preparation seems wider than their later opportunities. In history, as in all subjects pursued in the scientific method, trained experts and enthusiasm are both essential.

Local societies can of course accomplish most for their own neighbors, especially in places that have interesting sites, or stores of unpublished manuscripts, or buried treasures of rare books. It will be a century before the society of any town or city will have marked all the spots that ought to be commemorated, and by that time there will be another century's accumulation. The state societies, with a few exceptions, have not reached the measure of their opportunities to help their communities and their country, some of them have become genealogical mills and others are reposing on the reputation of past publications. They have a great field and only need to be roused to their work. To give an example of the place which they might have in the public mind, the first thought of any intelligent person into whose hands comes manuscript of any kind should be: "Would the state society accept this? or receive it? or deposit it? or publish it?" Valuable material ought to reach these societies as certainly as meteorites reach a mineralogical museum, for on the state societies rests the responsibility of keeping the sources from perishing. Perhaps the usefulness of the societies may be increased by the plan suggested by Professor Salmon of Vassar, for inducing them to enter into a kind of confederation, so as to secure mutual understanding and work on common lines.

One of the most hopeful signs in the historical field is the

growth in members and influence of the American Historical Association, the only national society devoted exclusively to historical aims. Although not founded until 1884, it has already become a kind of clearing-house for historical efforts, and its large brotherhood of scattered members come together in meetings which give valuable opportunities of acquaintance with other members of the craft, and which concentrate attention on historical problems. The meetings of 1896 in New York and 1897 in Cleveland were like those of a large club for good fellowship, and brought out lively discussions on interesting topics. But these two meetings, and that of 1895 at Washington, are chiefly memorable for the deliberate acceptance of new functions. Besides issuing the *Annual Report* (published by the government) the Association in the three successive years has instituted the Historical Manuscripts Commission, set up a prize which has since been once awarded, created the Committee of Seven on history in schools, and considered the question of taking over the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, an arrangement which the editors desire in the interests both of the periodical and of the Association; for all these laudable purposes the Association added works to faith by making generous grants of money. Whether the Association will go forward to assume any of the other labors which are waiting for an impulse is yet to be determined; but there is an injunction as well as a promise in the Scriptural suggestion: "To him that hath shall be given."

Plentiful are the American organizations which are trying to foster historical studies in multifarious directions; there is no lack of men or of organization, and will be none of material to work upon; for the next century will not be less exciting than that just expiring. Since behind records must stand things worthy of record, we may depend on the Hobsons and the Roosevelts to help make memorable history, just as John Paul Jones and Hull built up their country's renown. Perhaps a Central American contest may eventually overshadow the Mexican War; or the revolt of our distant colonies may one day cause us at last to understand our own Revolution. We may leave it to later generations fitly to perpetuate the stirring events of our own time and of the future; our present duty is simply to follow the principle of the Cambridge town meeting of 1765 in its vote on the Stamp Act: "That this vote be Recorded in the Town Book that the Children yet unborn may see the desire their Ancestors had for their freedom and happiness."

ALBERT BUSHNELL HART.



## THE EXECUTION OF THE DUC D'ENGHIEN

### II.

ON March 12, two days after he had ordered the Duc d'Enghien to be seized, the First Consul retired to the quiet and seclusion of Malmaison to unravel without interruption the last threads of the plot against his life, and to direct at the same time from a little distance the vengeance which he was determined to take upon all those whom he imagined connected with it. It was there, as we have seen, that he received the courier, Thibaud, announcing that the arrest was about to be made, and in reply sent orders that Enghien and Dumouriez were to be brought to Paris at once. It was from Malmaison also that he wrote the letter to Réal which has been cited above,<sup>1</sup> in which he told him to inquire of the commandant of Vincennes whether there was room to lock up the prisoners in that castle. This letter to Réal proves that already on March 15, even before he had heard that the Duc had actually been arrested, Bonaparte had made up his mind to send him to Vincennes instead of to the Temple, where Moreau and Georges were, and where state prisoners were ordinarily confined. He had further made up his mind, and this is the heaviest charge against Bonaparte and the one for which history will censure him most severely, that the Duc d'Enghien should not have the fair, open trial at Paris which justice and the law naturally accorded to a man accused of political conspiracy. Instead he was secretly handed over to a court-martial on the very night of his arrival in Paris, given a trial which outraged the name of justice, and sent to his death at once. Why did Bonaparte thus basely deny to the Duc d'Enghien the fair trial which was granted to Georges and his comrades? Because he knew Georges was a guilty man and would justly be convicted in a fair trial, but did not feel that the same was true of the Duc. There were many reasons which made him regard it as doubtful whether the regular tribunal at Paris could be induced to convict him. The violation of the electoral territory would furnish the Duc's advocates with an easy and strong line of defence, which would be backed up by the foreign diplomatic agents. Then again, as Cambacérès had

<sup>1</sup> Bonaparte to Réal, March 15, *supra*, Vol. III., pp. 639, 640.

suggested, public opinion in Paris, always fickle and uncertain, might turn in the Duc's favor and prevent his being put to death. A few days later Bonaparte publicly declared: "I ordered the prompt trial and execution of the Duc d'Enghien in order that the émigrés who had returned to Paris, and who in their hearts might have favored a change in favor of the Bourbons, might not be led into temptation. I feared that the long delays of a trial and the solemnity of condemnation might revive sentiments they could not have refrained from exhibiting, and I should have been obliged to hand them over to the Police"<sup>1</sup>—very kind and thoughtful, to be sure, on the part of the First Consul. He further feared, especially after he had read the Duc's papers and saw how little there really was in them to convict him, that the regular course of justice, with its slow and measured procedure, which fairly examined and weighed all evidence, would never sentence the Duc to death.

If his victim escaped from his hands after all, he would have already violated international law to no purpose; he would have given the Bourbons and their followers a triumph; and—a point on which he was always sensitive—he would have made a false step and exposed himself to the censure of Paris and the ridicule of Europe. This was the reason for which he had determined to send the Duc before a court-martial of military officers. This tribunal owed its origin to terrible times, having been fashioned by the Convention to execute its vengeance. Its judgments were executed within twenty-four hours; there was no appeal from them. There was little likelihood that the Duc d'Enghien would leave its clutches unharmed. The diplomatic agents would not intervene and protest, nor could public opinion be roused to save the unhappy man, for he would be executed before the public knew anything about it. The blow would be startling at first, but it would live in the imagination of men for a long time as a warning.

As early as March 16 Bonaparte had consulted with Murat as to the composition of the military court which was to sit at Vincennes and try the Duc d'Enghien and Dumouriez.<sup>2</sup> For he was still of the opinion that Dumouriez was undoubtedly at Ettenheim, and he naturally continued to think so until Saturday, March 17, and even the greater part of that day, until the arrival late in the afternoon of the courier from Strasburg bearing the series of reports from Caulaincourt, Ordener, and Charlot, telling in detail of the success of the expeditions to Ettenheim and Offenbourg. From these numerous reports it became certain that the Marquis de Thumery

<sup>1</sup> Miot de Méliot, *Mémoires*, II. 156-7 (Paris, 1858).

<sup>2</sup> Boulay de la Meurthe, p. 210.

had occasioned the mistake about Dumouriez's name. This gross blunder must have caused the First Consul some chagrin and surprise, but it would be a great mistake to suppose that his convictions with regard to the Duc were at all disconcerted or shaken. The Duc d'Enghien still appeared to him to be a man of the sort of which he had already determined him to be—young, bold, and injudicious; just the man to take part in a conspiracy and lead an invasion of France. In Charlot's report Bonaparte read that it had only been the coolness of one of his companions that prevented the Duc from shooting Charlot. According to the same information the Duc's opinions were not less violent than his acts: "The Duc d'Enghien esteems Bonaparte as a great man; but being a prince of the Bourbon family, he has vowed an implacable hatred to him, as well as to the French, against whom he will make war on all occasions."<sup>1</sup> A man who used such language as this, thought Bonaparte, ought not to be left at large if it could be helped. Though the supposed presence of Dumouriez at Ettenheim had contributed largely to bring about the arrest of the Duc, yet on the other hand the proven absence of Dumouriez did not in Bonaparte's mind in any way establish the innocence of the Duc, and he must suffer.

It was in this frame of mind that the First Consul heard mass at the Tuileries on Passion Sunday<sup>2</sup> and then returned to Malmaison. Josephine, being in a separate carriage with Madame de Rémusat, her lady in waiting, was uneasy, and finally confided to her companion the cause of her unhappiness: Bonaparte had just told her that the Duc d'Enghien had been seized on the frontier and was being brought to Paris to be tried. "I have done what I could," she continued, "to induce him to promise me that the Prince's life shall not be taken, but I fear his mind is made up."<sup>3</sup> This is still one more piece of evidence tending to show that Bonaparte had from the first formed the irrevocable decision to put the Duc to death.

The remainder of Sunday at Malmaison passed quietly. Early the next morning, or possibly very late the same night, a third courier arrived from Strasburg, bringing to Bonaparte the Duc's papers and the *procès-verbal* of their opening and examination by Charlot and Popp; these were the papers which had been despatched Saturday afternoon from Strasburg. Without summoning Réal or any other minister to help him, Bonaparte set himself to

<sup>1</sup> Charlot's report, *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 232.

<sup>2</sup> He had come from Malmaison to Paris on Saturday to transact business; it was at the Tuileries that the courier who brought Charlot's report and the other news from Strasburg found him.

<sup>3</sup> Rémusat, *Mém.*, I. 312 (Paris, 1880).

work to look over the papers. His eyes fell finally upon a draught of the note which the Duc had sent to Mr. Stuart to deliver to the English government two months before. It laid bare the plans of the Prince and bore witness to his obstinate and persistent desire to fight against the First Consul under the English flag. Two phrases especially impressed themselves upon the indignant mind of the First Consul; that in which the Duc called the French people "his most cruel enemy," and that in which he declared that "a residence of two years near the frontier had given him an opportunity to communicate with the troops that were on the Rhine."<sup>1</sup> What was Bonaparte to think of such sentiments, and this apparent tampering with the loyalty of French troops? Then there were not a few eager offers of service from men who had already served in the Army of Condé or other old companions of the Duc, for his circular letter reporting England's announcement that their pensions were to be doubled had given rise to a renewed activity in their correspondence. There were letters of this kind from Alsace, from Switzerland, and even from Holland, full of plans and advice, often wrongheaded, to be sure, and often incomprehensible, but nevertheless containing much that a prejudiced mind could easily imagine to be treasonable. Though he did not find anything to show that the Duc knew of the Cadoudal conspiracy or had any connection with Dumouriez, he probably reasoned that it made no difference to him whether the Duc knew of the plot or not, so long as he persisted in waiting upon the frontier of France for a favorable opportunity to invade Alsace, such as the assassination of the First Consul would afford. As the conspiracy had been known to the public now for more than a month, the Duc could not have been ignorant of it; why did he still remain within three leagues of France, when he must have known that it was not safe after all that had been discovered, unless he were about to lead a hostile force into Alsace or create a rebellion there? Reasoning in this way, and allowing his prejudiced mind to be influenced by apparent facts without fairly weighing both sides of the evidence, Bonaparte may have tried to satisfy his conscience that his already fixed opinion of the Duc's guilt was confirmed by the Duc's own papers, and that he ought to be put to death.

<sup>1</sup> Rereading the Duc's letter (*supra*, Vol. III., p. 623), it will be seen that these are not the exact phrases that he used, though the meaning is equivalent; they are the phrases that Bonaparte used in the set of questions which he prepared for Réal to ask the Duc (*infra*, pp. 33, 34). We cannot know in most cases exactly what Bonaparte found in the Duc's papers, for they have all disappeared; but we may have some idea of what it was, for this set of questions, which Bonaparte surely did not make up out of his own head, must have been partly at least suggested to him by what he found in the Duc's papers. We know exactly what was in the note to Stuart, because it is in the Austrian Record Office.

As a matter of fact there was nothing in all these papers that could justify the Duc's seizure in a neutral territory and his subsequent condemnation and execution. Not only was there no proof of complicity in a plot, but there was the Duc's categorical denial of such complicity,—he had no other intentions than to serve in war and make war. Charlot, who examined the papers at Strasburg, affirmed to Ségur that in all the Duc's correspondence he saw no traces of any connivance with the plot at Paris; he found nothing more than the proof of a gathering of émigrés on the right bank of the Rhine and communications held with the left bank.<sup>1</sup> The Duc's plans reached back for more than two years, long before the conspiracy of Georges; they followed the progress of the war and not of the conspiracy; there had been no definite preparation of money nor arms, nor any regular organization of troops which could at all threaten the safety of the state or the First Consul. That there was really no evidence against the Duc that could justly condemn him must have been recognized by Bonaparte on March 19 after the examination of the papers, although, as has just been said, he may have tried to convince his conscience, and always afterwards asserted in public, that in executing the Duc d'Enghien he was executing a guilty conspirator. The proof of this is that he did not send any of these papers, not even the *procès-verbal* of the opening of the papers, to the court-martial as evidence for the use of the judges; for he knew that they would not, in all probability, be so shameless and grossly unjust as to condemn a man to death when they saw that there was nothing in his papers to convict him. What did Bonaparte do with these papers, which, if made public, would show the people of France that the Duc d'Enghien did not merit death at all, but at the very worst only detention as a hostage till peace was made? He sent them to Réal and told him and Desmarêts to keep them in absolute secrecy, and not let the slightest news of what they contained be made public.<sup>2</sup> Réal obeyed his master so well that they never saw the light afterwards; the judges at the trial did not know of their existence. To have sent them the papers would have given rise to debates and would have necessitated the presence of a defending lawyer and witnesses. All this would have caused delay and endangered the sentence of condemnation. This fear of delay and openness, and Bonaparte's knowledge that there was nothing very incriminating in the Duc's papers, explains why they were kept

<sup>1</sup> Ségur, *Mém.*, II. 258.

<sup>2</sup> “ . . . Je vous recommande de prendre en secret avec Desmarêts connaissance de ces papiers. Il faut empêcher qu'il ne soit tenu aucun propos sur le plus ou moins de charges que contiennent ces papiers. . . .” Bonaparte to Réal, March 19; *Corr. de Nap.*, 7631.

secret instead of being sent to the persons who ought to have had them.

On Tuesday morning, March 20, as the Duc d'Enghien was drawing near Paris, Bonaparte drove from Malmaison to the Tuileries, as his habit often was, in order more easily to attend to affairs of state. Having already made up his mind on March 15 to send the Duc to Vincennes and on March 16 to have him tried by a court-martial, he now dictated in a Council of State the following decree :

"*Article I.* The *ci-devant* Duc d'Enghien, accused of having borne arms against the Republic ; of having been, and still being, in the pay of England ; and of taking part in the plots woven by this latter power against the interior and exterior safety of the Republic, is to be brought before a court-martial composed of seven members named by the Governor of Paris and sitting at Vincennes.

"*Article II.* The Grand Judge, the Minister of War, and the Governor of Paris are charged with the execution of the present decree."

"BONAPARTE."<sup>1</sup>

In accordance with this decree Murat, Governor of Paris, chose the seven members of the court-martial : Bazancourt, Ravier, Barrois, Rabbe, Guiton, colonels of regiments garrisoned in Paris ; and, in addition to these five, General Hulin, an ardent patriot who had assisted at the taking of the Bastille, was chosen to act as president of the court-martial, and Dautancourt, major of gendarmes, as judge-advocate (*capitaine-rapporteur*). These seven men, in order that everything concerning the Duc might be done as secretly as possible and no rumors get abroad before the deed was completed, did not receive notice from the Minister of War to go to Murat's house till late in the afternoon. They came immediately one by one to Murat, and each was told that he was to form part of a court-martial, "which is to meet as soon as possible at Vincennes, to judge there, without leaving the spot, an accused man on the charges given in a decree of the government, which will be sent to the president."<sup>2</sup> They thereupon betook themselves separately to Vincennes, each wondering who the accused might be, but with not the faintest idea that it was a Bourbon prince.

On Tuesday afternoon about five o'clock, that is, just after he had received notice that the Duc was at the barrier of Paris, Bona-

<sup>1</sup> *Archives nationales*, AF<sup>IV</sup> 915 (quoted by Welschinger, p. 313).

<sup>2</sup> " . . . Cette commission se réunira sur-le-champ au château de Vincennes, pour y juger, sans délai, le prévenu sur les charges énoncées dans l'arrêt du gouvernement, dont copie sera mise au président.—J. Murat."—Nougarede, II. 93 ; *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 93.



parte sent for Savary, who had just returned from Biville in Normandy, and told him that he was to take a brigade of troops from Paris to Vincennes, guard the place, and execute the decision of the court-martial which he would find there. But as Murat was governor of Paris and of the troops stationed there, Savary was also given a letter from the First Consul, which he was to deliver to Murat. Murat read the letter and may have given Savary some further directions about the troops of which he was to have charge.<sup>1</sup> Bonaparte had chosen Savary for this mission because he knew of his devotion to himself, and because he knew that he would have no scruples in executing the decision of the court-martial without delay. Savary arrived at Vincennes about eight o'clock in the evening, and, having stationed his troops around the chateau, saw the seven members of the court-martial arrive separately. By eleven o'clock these eight men had gathered around the fire in Harel's room; with them was Brunet, Murat's aide-de-camp, who had just arrived with the government's decree of accusation. Everything being now ready, Major Dautancourt went into the next room, where the Duc d'Enghien was sleeping soundly, and waked him for a preliminary examination.

It has often been supposed that Bonaparte intended that Réal, who had seen the Duc's papers and was fully acquainted with the whole affair, should be present at the trial and guide the judge-advocate, Dautancourt, in his work;<sup>2</sup> for Réal knew something

<sup>1</sup> Savary, in 1823, actuated by a feeling of spite and a desire to heap calumny on every one else who had been in any way connected with the Enghien affair, in order to draw attention away from his own share in the matter, accuses Murat of having given him the orders about taking the troops to Vincennes, in accordance with the directions just received in the letter from Bonaparte. He says that he did not even know, when he left Malmaison, that the Duc had been seized, nor what was contained in the letter of which he was the bearer. But Pasquier (I. 204 *seq.*) and the recently published notes of the Comte de Mosbourg in *Murat, Lieutenant de l'Empereur en Espagne* (Paris, 1897), pp. 437-445, leave no doubt that Savary, as his whole later conduct tends to show, was carrying out the will of his master, the First Consul, and had got his orders from him and not merely from Murat. He probably knew, too, the contents of the letter, which Pasquier (p. 204) says contained "the most formal orders not only to have the Duc tried and sentenced, but not to suffer any delay to occur in his execution and to anticipate all preparations." It was only in consequence of this second peremptory order from Bonaparte that Murat was finally forced to give the order for the assembly of the military commission to sit at Vincennes and judge the prisoner "*sans désespérer*." For on that same Tuesday morning, when the first message came to him about eleven o'clock from Bonaparte asking him to appoint the men for the military commission, he indignantly refused, exclaiming, "What! are they trying to soil my uniform! I will not tolerate such a thing. Let him [Bonaparte] appoint them himself if he wants to." Bonaparte accordingly did so. Pasquier, I. 206; also completely confirmed in detail by Comte de Mosbourg's note.

<sup>2</sup> As a civilian Réal could have taken no formal part in the proceedings of a court-martial; but he could, of course, have been present and made suggestions to Dautancourt.

about legal forms, while Dautancourt did not, and Réal knew the points which might best be brought up against the accused. This question is discussed below; for the present it is enough to say that Réal was not at Vincennes, and Dautancourt was left to blunder along as best he could. The only two documents that he had to guide him in interrogating the Duc were (1) Murat's order that the court-martial should try the accused without leaving the spot, and (2) the decree of the government which charged the Duc with three things; with having borne arms against the Republic, with being in the pay of England, and with taking part in the Cadoudal conspiracy.<sup>1</sup> The judge-advocate considered this decree as his guide, and contented himself with asking the Duc some needless questions on these three points, which were answered frankly and explicitly by the Duc. That he was an émigré and had fought in the Army of Condé was a fact well known to Dautancourt and all who were acquainted with the revolutionary wars. In answer to the second charge the Duc said he did receive money from England, but it was as a pension, which was given him as his only means of support, and not as wages for serving England in war. Lastly, he disdainfully repudiated the idea that he could have had anything to do with a conspiracy. He declared that he had never seen Pichegru nor Dumouriez, nor had the slightest relations with them; he was glad that he had not, if it was true that they had used the vile means which were reported. He said that he corresponded with his father and grandfather in England and with some old friends in France, not on political projects, but solely on personal matters.<sup>2</sup> The judge-advocate, thinking that he had asked enough for form's sake, requested the Duc to sign the *procès-verbal* of the answers he had just given, for by French law his own evidence is read to the accused and he signifies his admission that it is correctly reported by signing the document. The Duc wrote:

"Before signing this *procès-verbal*, I earnestly request that I may have an interview with the First Consul. My name, my rank,

<sup>1</sup> It will be remembered that Bonaparte had told Réal to suppress the Duc's papers. A contemporary account of the proceedings says that Hulin "had the prisoner led in free and without handcuffs, and ordered the judge-advocate to read the documents both in favor of and against the accused, to the number of one." This one document was the decree of the government. (*Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 100; also Welschinger, 325.) Savary also admits (*Mémoires*, II. 394) that Hulin could produce only one document, the decree of the government, against the Duc; but that this was all that was necessary; more or less evidence would have made no difference in the result, because Hulin, when chosen president of the commission, was given to understand that the accused must be condemned.

<sup>2</sup> Dupin's pamphlet on the trial, printed in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*; also Appendix V. of Scott's *Life of Napoleon*.

my way of thinking, and the horror of my situation, lead me to hope that he will not refuse my request.

"L. A. H. de Bourbon."

When the interrogatory was thus completed, the prisoner was brought unshackled into the room where the court-martial was sitting ready to perpetrate an atrocious crime in the name of Justice.

It was a little after midnight. The light of a few flaring torches fell across the faces of the seven ministers of death. Brunet, Murat's aide-de-camp, stood at one side. Savary, like a vulture waiting for its prey, hovered ominously behind the chair of the president, eager to prevent any delay or hesitation on the part of the judges.

That the trial took place in the secrecy of night was in itself irregular. But this was by no means the only irregularity and injustice of the proceedings. By military law the prisoner was entitled to a copy of the charges, the services of a defending advocate, and sufficient time to prepare his defence; all these necessary rights were denied him. There were no witnesses nor was there any evidence worthy of the name. Still worse, according to Hulin's own admission neither he nor any of the other members of the court knew anything about law and judicial procedure; they owed their position merely to what they had done on the field of battle; they had not "*la moindre notion en matière de jugemens.*"<sup>1</sup> The mockery of forms which now followed outrages the name of a judicial trial; it consisted simply of a cross-examination of the Duc from his own answers to the interrogations just put to him by Dautancourt. He proudly repeated what he had already said, repudiating the charge of having directly or indirectly taken part in a plot to assassinate the First Consul; he acknowledged that he had upheld the rights of his family, and said that a Condé could enter France only with arms in his hand. "My birth and my opinions will always make me the enemy of your government," he added with such unnecessary boldness, inspired by a feeling of pride in his ancestors and complete confidence in his own innocence, that Hulin said warningly: "From the way you answer, you seem to be mistaken as to your real position; take care; this will become serious, and court-martials give judgments from which there is no appeal." The Duc was silent for a moment; then he raised his head and said, "I know it; I ask only to have an interview with the First Consul."<sup>2</sup>

The cross-examination concluded, the prisoner was led out

<sup>1</sup> Hulin's *Explications offertes aux hommes impartiaux*, in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 118.

<sup>2</sup> Hulin's *Explications*, p. 120.

again and the court deliberated in secret as to the sentence. One exceptional circumstance in the trial well justified delay; this was the request of the Duc for an interview with the First Consul. One of the judges, Barrois, was in favor of granting the request; but Hulin, who the evening before had had a long conference with Bonaparte,<sup>1</sup> and knew well that a sentence of death and a speedy execution were expected by him, was opposed to granting the request; the other judges also favored an immediate sentence in accordance with Murat's order that they were to complete their work "*sans d'essuyer*." Savary was consulted, as knowing better than any one else the intentions of Bonaparte; he represented that such a delay would be "inopportune" and displeasing to the First Consul.<sup>2</sup> The hint was sufficient, and the judges decided that the Duc should be condemned to death without delay. It remained only to write the sentence. But this was no easy matter, for the main charge, that of complicity in the conspiracy, was not only unproved by any evidence, but was directly denied by the Duc's clear statement. In writing out the sentence, this idea of complicity in the plot had to be omitted, and the judges, taking the Duc's answer as a basis, tried to draw up a sentence which could fit the facts and yet make the Duc liable to the penalty of death. Many drafts were made before they got one that they thought would do. According to the regular form the sentence ought to mention the exact law under which the accused was found guilty. The judges had an idea that there was some revolutionary law which condemned to death émigrés who had fought against their country, but they were quite ignorant of its exact wording or where to find it.<sup>3</sup> To look it up would be a work

<sup>1</sup> Rémusat, *Mémoires*, I. 323; Savary also distinctly asserts (*Mémoires*, II. 399) that Hulin some years later, in exile at Brussels, when questioned about his conduct in the Enghien affair, said, "I only acted in consequence of the most severe instructions. The possibility that the Duc would demand an interview with the First Consul was foreseen and I was forbidden to allow such a demand to be presented to the government." The truth of the last part of this statement of Savary is doubtful.

<sup>2</sup> Hulin's *Explications*, p. 119.

<sup>3</sup> The law they were thinking of was that of 25 Brumaire, An III., tit. 5, sect. 1, art. 7, which provided that "émigrés who have borne arms against France shall be arrested, whether in France or in any hostile or conquered country, and judged within twenty-fours," etc. But the Duc was neither arrested in France nor within the precincts of any hostile or conquered country, but was seized by force illegally in a country in friendly relations with France, so that this law was not applicable to him. Even had he been arrested in a hostile country, it would have been unjust and ridiculous to sentence him to death on the ground of this law, for it had long been a dead letter; it was no longer looked upon as a crime to have fought against France from 1792 to 1799; the revolutionary war was a thing of the past; the great mass of émigrés had been amnestied; it was part of Bonaparte's wise policy to encourage exiles to return; and many of the old soldiers of Condé were now in the ranks of the French army or had become ornaments of the consular court.

of some difficulty and cause delay. It was necessary that the Duc should be found guilty and executed immediately, unless they wished to incur the displeasure of the First Consul. It would, therefore, be time enough, after the Duc was dead and buried, to consider under what law he had suffered, and to fill out the blanks accordingly. One would have thought civilized men could not be guilty of such an act, but here is the judgment to speak for itself:—"The prisoner was led out; the court having deliberated with closed doors, and the president having collected the votes of the members, beginning with the youngest and voting himself last, the prisoner was unanimously found guilty; and in accordance with article (*blank*) of the law (*blank*) to the following effect (*blank*), was condemned to suffer death. Ordered, that the judge-advocate see that the present sentence is executed immediately."<sup>1</sup> This was signed by the seven judges, though not by the clerk as it ought to have been.

Then, if we are to believe Hulin's statement, the judges were a little ashamed of the base piece of work they had done, and all agreed that Hulin should write a letter to Bonaparte, telling him of the Duc's request for an interview, and begging him "to remit a sentence which the rigor of our position did not allow us to avoid." At this moment Savary approached Hulin, and, seeing what he was doing, snatched away the pen, saying, "Your part is over; the rest belongs to me."<sup>2</sup>

The Duc was awaiting the decision of the court in the next room without fear and even without impatience, when Harel entered with a troubled face and motioned him to follow. After a few steps they emerged into the open court, and saw by the flickering light of torches that they were face to face with a squad of soldiers whom Savary had drawn up. An adjutant advanced and read the sentence to the Duc, who heard it with firmness and self-possession. He asked for a priest, but this was denied him. Ever thoughtful of her who was to mourn so much for him, he asked for a pair of scissors, cut off a lock of his hair, slipped off his ring, and gave them with a note to an officer, who promised to deliver them to the Princess de Rohan. The squad of soldiers advanced. The Duc begged them above all things not to miss their aim. He bent his head in prayer a moment and commended his soul to his Maker. He looked up again bravely into the mouths of the loaded muskets. An instant later the shots rang out and the innocent man fell dead, shot through the heart.

<sup>1</sup> Dupin's pamphlet in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, 101; also in App. V. of Scott's *Life of Napoleon*.

<sup>2</sup> Hulin's *Explications*, p. 123; also Pasquier, I. 201.

A few steps away was a hole which had been dug in the ground the day before in accordance with Harel's orders; whether he intended it as a grave, knowing that the Duc would surely be shot, or whether it was merely to put some rubbish in, as was said twelve years later by the man who dug it, is uncertain.<sup>1</sup> Into this hole the Duc was pitched with all his clothes on, his feet higher than his head,<sup>2</sup> and the earth was thrown in again. The death and burial took place by torchlight between three and four o'clock in the morning.<sup>3</sup> Thus the trial and execution were both in the dark and secrecy of night, and were marked by the same unseemly haste and cruel injustice that characterized all the First Consul's orders for the destruction of an unfortunate man whose crime, as Savary himself acknowledged, consisted in his being the Duc d'Enghien.

What was the account given to Paris of the proceedings of the court-martial? They were too disgraceful to be told; all that appeared in the *Moniteur* the next morning was a copy of the judgment supposed to have been rendered.<sup>4</sup> This, however, was not the shameful sentence of death, full of blanks and irregularities, which was to be executed "*de suite*," and under which the Duc had really been sent to his death. For when Réal brought a copy of that outrageous document to Bonaparte, he saw that it would never do to make it public.<sup>5</sup> Instead he took as a basis the questions that he had sent to Réal, and wrote out a new indictment and sentence, which differed wholly from the real judgment.<sup>6</sup> This new copy, which was the one published in the *Moniteur*, accused the Duc on six different grounds and found him guilty on each. Several of these had absolutely no connection with the charge upon which the Duc had been arrested; the rest were unsupported by evidence, as

<sup>1</sup> Bourrienne (II. 269) asserts positively that Harel told him he had received orders the day before the execution to have a grave dug ready for the corpse.

<sup>2</sup> He was so found twelve years later, when his body was exhumed and given a decent burial in the chapel at Vincennes. The account of the exhumation and of the evidence taken at that time is given in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, pp. 301-324.

<sup>3</sup> This is proved by an extant letter from Hulin to a friend, quoted by Welschinger (p. 339). Ségur also relates that he met Dautancourt early that same morning at General Duroc's, whither both had gone to make their report, and heard him say, "He was shot in the moat at three o'clock in the morning." (Ségur, *Memoirs of an Aide-de-Camp*, p. 112.)

<sup>4</sup> *Moniteur*, I Germinal (March 22, 1804).

<sup>5</sup> "The official report of the judgment was presented to Napoleon the same day [March 21]. The perusal of this document was a subject of fresh grief to him. Legal forms had not been respected. The irregularities and omissions which he noticed in it caused him to order it to be rewritten." Méneval, I. 262.

<sup>6</sup> Pasquier, I. 199; Dupin's pamphlet, pp. 82-85; Appendix to Scott's *Napoleon*; and in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 259, we read, "le jour même de l'exécution du Prince on en rédigea un autre jugement dans les bureaux de Réal. C'est celui-ci, et non l'original de la commission, qui fut affiché le lendemain."



for instance, the last, which we quote to show the falsity of the document with which Bonaparte wished to deceive the public: "The court declares the Duc d'Enghien . . . (6) unanimously, guilty of being one of the accomplices of the conspiracy carried on by the English against the life of the First Consul; and intending in the event of the success of such conspiracy to enter France."

After the execution was over and the judges had dispersed, Savary sent the troops back to their barracks, and started for Malmaison to tell his master what had been done. When he reached the barrier he saw R  al's carriage and stopped him to ask him where he was going. "To Vincennes," R  al replied; "I received last night orders to go there and interrogate the Duc d'Enghien." Savary told him what had taken place. Savary says he was as much astonished himself at what he heard from R  al as R  al was at what he heard from him. R  al's reflection, after a moment, was, "Le Premier Consul sera furieux." But Savary having undertaken to see Bonaparte first,<sup>1</sup> R  al turned his carriage around and followed at a little distance, fearful of the reception which he would meet.<sup>2</sup> Savary arrived at Malmaison, was at once ushered into the First Consul's study, and related in a few words what had been done.<sup>3</sup> On hearing that the Duc had asked to see him, the First Consul interrupted him to ask what had become of R  al and whether he had not gone to Vincennes. Hearing that he had not, he remained silent, walking up and down his library with his hands crossed behind his back, till R  al appeared. After listening to the latter's explanation, he fell again into a reverie; then, without expressing a word either of approval or blame, he remarked, "It is well," and marched off upstairs, leaving Savary and R  al in surprise and doubt.

The night before the trial Bonaparte had written a letter to R  al, telling him to go at once to Vincennes and ask the Duc d'Enghien certain questions, of which the most important were:<sup>4</sup>

- "1. Have you borne arms against your country?
- "2. Have you been in the pay of England?
- "4. Have you not had communication with the English and placed yourself at their disposal . . . , and have you not so far

<sup>1</sup> It is a significant fact that Savary did not show any concern at the consequences of his haste in the matter; he evidently knew that he had done what was expected of him.

<sup>2</sup> Pasquier, I. 195; Rovigo's *Extrait des M  m.*, in *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, p. 35.

<sup>3</sup> M  neval was present and relates what passed. *Memoirs of Napoleon I.* (trans. by Sherard, London, 1894), I. 261-264.

<sup>4</sup> *Corr. de Nap.*, 7639.

forgotten your natural feelings as to call the French your most cruel enemy?

"5. Have you not proposed to raise a legion and cause French troops to desert from the Republic, saying that your residence during two years near the frontier had put you in the way of communicating with the French troops on the Rhine?

"9. Were you not cognizant of a plot formed by the English for the overthrow of the government; and had the plot been successful would you not have entered Alsace and even gone to Paris, according to the circumstances?"

It seems probable that Bonaparte meant sincerely what he said in his letter, and intended that Réal should be present at the trial; and that it was owing to an accident that Réal was not there. The letter came to Réal's house about ten o'clock at night; there was still time to reach Vincennes before the trial, if he had hurried. But, tired out with overwork, he had gone to bed early; having been waked up twice already by unimportant messages, he had positively forbidden his servant to disturb him again before morning. When the letter from Bonaparte came, the servant, ignorant of its real importance, laid it on the table by his master's bed. Happening to wake up about four o'clock Réal saw the letter, dressed hastily, and started for Vincennes, but met Savary at the barrier, as mentioned above, when the affair was all over.<sup>1</sup>

But although we admit that Bonaparte was acting sincerely when he wrote to Réal to go to Vincennes, it would be a great mistake to suppose that, in so doing, he intended to pardon the Duc afterwards, or even intended that Réal should in any way delay the sentence and execution so as to leave a chance for clemency open. For, as has been pointed out above, the First Consul's mind was made up from the first that the Duc must die; he felt sure that the court-martial would condemn him,<sup>2</sup> and he never at any time intended to thwart his own work by reversing the sentence of the court-martial and pardoning him;<sup>3</sup> people would laugh at him and say that he was

<sup>1</sup> Méneval, I. 260.

<sup>2</sup> "The First Consul, whose mind was made up, had no doubt that the Duc would be condemned." Méneval, I. 260.

<sup>3</sup> Napoleon himself declared, in answer to Sir G. Cockburn's inquiry whether there was any truth in the report that he had sent an order for the Duc's reprieve, but that it had unfortunately arrived too late: "It certainly was *not* true, for the Duc was condemned for having conspired against France, and I was determined from the first to let the law take its course respecting him, in order if possible to check the frequent conspiracies." *Bonaparte's Voyage to St. Helena, comprising the Diary of Rear-Admiral Cockburn*, p. 122 (Boston, 1833). We are inclined to believe that this diary contains much or all of the "unpublished memoranda" which Mr. G. Barnett Smith says have lately come into his possession and from which he gives three short extracts in the *Nineteenth*

afraid to put a Bourbon to death. No, Réal was not sent to Vincennes to act as a brake on the proceedings, but for the very opposite purpose. He was to show the judge-advocate his business and help him over any questions or difficulties that might arise unexpectedly; and he was to convince the other judges, by his greater knowledge of the affair and his experience in politics, that they must speedily find the accused guilty for the sake of the safety of the state. That this was Bonaparte's intention in sending Réal is further confirmed by the closing words of his letter: "You are to guide the public prosecutor and instruct him of the necessity of expediting the proceedings."<sup>1</sup> Réal's mission was not for the sake of clemency.

Did Bonaparte recognize afterwards that he had made a false step, and committed an unnecessary wrong? Undoubtedly, yes. When the fact of the Duc's innocence became more clearly established from the examination of his papers, from the other good reports of him that came from Baden after the execution, from the knowledge that Dumouriez had not left England, and from the circumstance that there were no hundreds of émigrés on the right bank of the Rhine, it would be doing injustice to Bonaparte's mental qualities to say that he still thought his own safety or that of the state had demanded such a victim.<sup>2</sup> He must, moreover, have seen that it had hurt him in the estimation of the French people; for the moral sense of the nineteenth century was different from that of the eighteenth, and the same men who a few years before had looked with consenting approval on the events of the Reign of Terror were now alarmed at the possibility of its renewal. They had hoped that in Bonaparte they had found a ruler who would secure internal peace and justice to France, and they feared that they were to be disappointed in this hope. Many of those nearest the First Consul had opposed his course from the outset, and did not hesitate to express their disapproval of the deed.<sup>3</sup> The only remedy was arbitrary prohibition of all discussion and to this Bonaparte had recourse. It

*Century*, January, 1897, p. 142. The statement quoted above from Cockburn's diary is exactly confirmed by the diary of John R. Glover, Secretary to Rear-Admiral Cockburn, published in *Napoleon's Last Voyages* (London, 1895), p. 184.

<sup>1</sup> "Il sera nécessaire que vous conduisiez l'accusateur public, qui doit être le major de la gendarmerie d'élite, et que vous l'instruisiez de la suite rapide à donner à la procédure." *Corr. de Nap.*, 7639.

<sup>2</sup> See Bonaparte to Melzi, March 6, 1804, *Corr. de Nap.*, 7591.

<sup>3</sup> For the gloom and disapproval which the Duc's death caused in France see Chateaubriand, *Mém. d'Outre-tombe*, II. 431-434, Bourrienne, II. 268, 272-279, and Doris, pp. 116-118. It is in striking contrast with the exuberant joy of the people of Paris two weeks before when Georges Cadoudal was captured and prevented from injuring the First Consul.

was clear that he was disappointed in the way in which France received the news; he had intended to produce a result diametrically opposite—to fix the blame of the Duc's death on England and the Bourbons;<sup>1</sup> instead the people of France laid the blame on him.

Outside of France the effect of the Duc's death was still worse. The news sent a shudder through all Europe; the ruler of France, soon to make himself Emperor, was looked upon as little less than a murderer, with whom the other sovereigns could have nothing in common.<sup>2</sup> For the moment, to be sure, the rest of Europe was unable to take any steps to retaliate seriously upon the First Consul. The Czar of Russia showed his strong disapproval by putting his court into mourning and sending a note to the German Diet urging that the same action be taken on account of the recent violation of the territory of Baden. But he had to content himself for the present with breaking off diplomatic relations with France; he could find no one on the continent to join with him in declaring war. Prussia remained neutral and her king silent. Austria withdrew her troops from Suabia in accordance with Talleyrand's demand, and sent a courier to Paris to say that "she could understand certain political necessities." Dynastic politics had therefore, for the moment, rendered the public expression of opinion impossible. But in the autumn Russia and Austria began to draw together against the common enemy. The European cabinets never forgot the reckless neglect of the rights secured by international law, which Bonaparte showed in the case of the Duc d'Enghien; a man who had acted thus would do worse; there could be no peace nor safety for Europe while he ruled in France; he must be continually fought against till expelled. At this disapproval on the part of France and increased hatred from the rest of Europe, Bonaparte was mortified and angry; he saw that he had made a mistake, he had put to death a man who was not guilty, and it had done him harm instead of good; he was expressing his true thoughts when he dictated to Méneval the statement that the death of the Duc d'Enghien "hurt Napoleon in public opinion and politically was of no use to him."<sup>3</sup> It was this same feeling of angry mortification at what he had done that led him to reproach Talleyrand so bitterly in 1809, and later

<sup>1</sup> Bonaparte expressly asserted that "the death of the Duc d'Enghien must be attributed to the Comte d'Artois, who directed and commanded from London the assassination of Napoleon." Méneval, I. 270.

<sup>2</sup> Gustavus Adolphus was only expressing the universal feeling when he sent back to the King of Prussia the Order of the Black Eagle, saying "he could not consent to be the brother-in-arms of the assassin of the Duc d'Enghien." Chateaubriand, *Mém. d'Outre-tombe*, II. 438 *seq.*

<sup>3</sup> Méneval, I. 267.

at St. Helena to try to lay the blame of the Duc's death on him and his other overzealous advisers.<sup>1</sup>

But at other times his pride and self-possession mastered his real feelings; he would not admit that he had done a wrong which was of no use; he must not let the people of France know that Napoleon Bonaparte had made a false step; so he boldly and frequently declared in public that the Duc was guilty of sharing in the conspiracy against his life; that he had him put to death for his own safety and that of the state. The law of nature, he said to Las Cases, justified him in taking measures for self-defense: "I was assailed on all sides by enemies whom the Bourbons had raised up against me. Threatened with air-guns, infernal machines, and treacherous plots of all kinds, I seized the occasion to strike terror even as far as London."<sup>2</sup> And, finally, on his death-bed at St. Helena, when a maladroit attendant read from an English review a scathing account of the Duc's murder, the dying man's pride and obstinate persistency in trying to make the deed seem less odious by declaring that it was a measure necessary to the safety of the state, gave him strength to rise from his bed, catch up his will, and insert, in a narrow space between the lines, a defiant justification which should stand forever before the world as his last word on the subject: "I had the Duc d'Enghien arrested and tried, because it was necessary to do so for the safety, the interests, and the honor of the French people, at a time when the Comte d'Artois openly admitted that he had sixty paid assassins in Paris. In like circumstances, I should do so again."<sup>3</sup>

In spite of these declarations, dictated by a feeling of pride and unwillingness to admit a mistake, there can be no doubt that the execution of the Duc d'Enghien was one of Bonaparte's greatest political mistakes and was one of many causes that led subsequently to his downfall.<sup>4</sup> There is much truth in the remark that Fouché is reported to have made on this sad affair,—“It was worse than a crime; it was a blunder.”

SIDNEY B. FAY.

<sup>1</sup> Las Cases, VII. 310-337; see also in Pasquier, I. 211, an anecdote which shows the anger that was aroused in Napoleon when reminded of this blot on his character.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also his statement to Admiral Cockburn, *supra*.

<sup>3</sup> *Catastrophe du Duc d'Enghien*, 299.

<sup>4</sup> Méneval (III. 474), who puts things in the most favorable light for Napoleon, in summing up the half-dozen most important causes of his overthrow, names first, the hatred of the European dynasties for the new régime in France; second, England's command of the sea; and third, "the condemnation of the Duc d'Enghien, a painful event, a fatal episode in Napoleon's reign, of which the enemies of our country, in their bad faith and animosity, did not fail to take advantage in their campaigns against France and her chief."

## THE OUTCOME OF THE CABOT QUATER-CENTENARY

IT cannot be said that the four-hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the American continent by John Cabot was celebrated with as much enthusiasm as that of the West Indies by Columbus. A good test is the number of historical and literary productions published on those two occasions. For the achievement of the great Genoese, we know of six hundred and fifty books and pamphlets printed in 1891 and 1892, in nearly all the languages of Europe, in prose and verse. Concerning Cabot's discovery, we have heard of only two or three volumes, a dozen review and newspaper articles, three memoirs, an address, four speeches, two medleys of barefaced plagiarism, the one fabricated in Bristol, the other, quite recently, in London, and no poem at all. The indifference of the public, at home and abroad, was further shown by the utter failure of the subscription which Americans residing in England started for the purpose of arranging a plan whereby adequate notice might be taken of the event in Bristol. Yet John Cabot is certainly more to the people of England and of the United States than Christopher Columbus is in many respects, although he cannot be justly credited with greater forecast in the accomplishment of his famous deed.

Scanty as those publications may be, they nevertheless afford a certain interest. Three or four of them are curious on different accounts. One shows original investigations, and although based upon positive errors, with conclusions quite as erroneous, it does credit to its author. Another exhibits honest recantations, indicating that conscientious historians now generally adopt notions concerning the Cabots, particularly Sebastian, which a few years ago were almost hooted at. A third and fourth afford fair samples of the historical erudition of distinguished orators, lay and clerical. We only propose to examine the questions alleged to have been solved in all these Cabotian effusions, and especially the intrinsic worth of the statements brought forward to bolster delusions regarding the memorable transatlantic voyage of 1497.



I.

We first notice a paper of Dr. Samuel Edward Dawson inserted in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*.<sup>1</sup> It is called in that country "an admirable monograph, incomparably the best thing ever written on the subject, and to the author of which we must all doff our caps." That paper is also represented, in certain academic quarters, "to have settled the long-disputed question of Cabot's landfall."<sup>2</sup>

The problem has been mooted by Dr. Dawson, we confess, with skill and an adequate knowledge of the subject. To us, personally, it is a positive relief to see at last a critic who answers facts, arguments and documents, not with shallow and puerile reasons, betraying an incredible ignorance of the matter, as is so often the case, but by resorting to objections which deserve to be seriously discussed, however erroneous they may prove to be in important particulars.

Dr. Dawson is convinced that the landfall of John Cabot in 1497 is the easternmost point of Cape Breton; and he has endeavored to prove it by a theory of his own concerning the magnetic variations, at first as follows:

"If Columbus on a direct western course dropped two hundred and forty miles from Gomera his point of departure to his landfall in the Antilles in 1492 with a variation of one point west, it is altogether probable that John Cabot with a variation of a point and a half would have dropped, in 1497, three hundred and sixty miles to the south on his western course across the Atlantic; and, again, if John Cabot laid his course to the west by compass from latitude  $53^{\circ}$  north the variation, so much greater than that observed by Columbus, would have carried him clear of Cape Race and to the next probable landfall, Cape Breton."<sup>3</sup>

If language means anything, it is plain that, according to the above extract, Dr. Dawson's premises were Columbus's course from Gomera and Cabot's course from latitude  $53^{\circ}$  north. It likewise sets forth as the basis for measuring the length of the line of divergence the length of the course from Gomera to Guanahani. For what can be clearer than the phrase which we underscore? Nor is the wording corrected or contradicted anywhere in Dr. Dawson's memoir.

At the outset it must be said that even admitting, for the sake of argument, Dr. Dawson's hypothesis that John Cabot experienced a magnetic variation of a point and a half, he nevertheless would

<sup>1</sup> Vol. XII., Sec. II., 1894, and Vol. II., Sec. II., 1896.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Harvey's remarks in *op. cit.*, 1896, Vol. II., Sec. II., p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1894, p. 58.

not have dropped three hundred and sixty miles, as Dr. Dawson has said and believed. It has been demonstrated<sup>1</sup> by  $a + b$  that Cabot would have dropped one hundred and eighty-three miles only. And, consequently, (always as a logical inference from Dr. Dawson's theory, such as we find it explicitly stated in the said memoir), instead of making his landfall at Cape Breton, as our learned opponent asserts or asserted, Cabot would have made it just *one hundred and seventy-seven miles more to the northward*; that is to say, in Newfoundland, on the eastern shore of Cape Bauld.

So much for "incomparably the best thing ever written on the subject," and "the settlement of the long-disputed question of Cabot's landfall at Cape Breton," as Canadian savants declare.

That was four years ago. Dr. Dawson now holds and claims to have meant that in measuring the length of the line of divergence south of a due western course, "we must commence in the case of Cabot near the coast of Ireland, and in the case of Columbus at a considerable distance west of Gomera."<sup>2</sup> That is a new proposition altogether, and absolutely adverse to the very precise expressions employed by him in 1894. Under the circumstances, it is surprising that Dr. Dawson, as the expert writer that he is, should have written so clearly "If Columbus on a direct western course dropped 240 miles *from Gomera*," instead of writing as he does at this late hour, and again erroneously as we propose to show: "Columbus dropped 240 miles from the place where the westing of his compass reached one point," or "in  $40^\circ$  longitude," or "at a considerable distance west of Gomera."

Be that as it may, Dr. Dawson's new position is just as untenable as the first. It again rests upon an aggregation of bare hypotheses.<sup>3</sup> He gratuitously assumes that the laws of secular motion of the curves of equal variation on the surface of the globe are sufficiently known to enable him to infer from the variations which Columbus experienced in  $25^\circ$  north latitude, the variations which Cabot experienced in  $53^\circ$  north latitude. He also takes for granted

<sup>1</sup> For a mathematical demonstration of the fallacy, see the *Nachrichten von der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philolog.-histor. Klasse, 1897, Heft 3, pp. 345-348.

<sup>2</sup> *The Voyages of the Cabots*. Roy. Soc. Can., Vol. III., Sec. II., 1897, p. 161.

<sup>3</sup> "In a brief interview I had with Mr. Fox, I took occasion to express my conviction of the impossibility of arriving at any very definite conclusion, partly on account of the extremely scanty material as to facts and partly in consequence of the want of assistance derivable from purely theoretical grounds; the cause of the phenomenon of the secular change of the magnetic declination being quite unknown and the time comparatively short during which to trace the law of change as hitherto observed." Charles A. Schott, *An Inquiry into the Variation of the Compass*, Coast Survey Reports for 1880.

(theoretically) that the variations experienced by Cabot cannot possibly have been inferior or superior to one point and a half west, or eastwardly, or *nil*; which assumption, whether expressed or implied, is entirely unwarranted.

The learned Canadian likewise argues as if we were as well posted regarding the particulars of Cabot's voyage as we are concerning that of Columbus. He forgets that we know nothing whatever about Cabot's course, beyond the naked fact that he sailed west from some undetermined point on the western coast of Ireland and "wandered a good deal:—*hæcundo assai errato*." How can a reflective and investigating mind build upon such vague data, were it partly only, the asseveration that Cabot's course was west magnetic, and that the corresponding true course was this magnetic course west, corrected by one point and a half of variation?

As a sort of apology, Dr. Dawson at present informs his readers that the "increment of variation was not intended to be, and could not be, an argument in the least degree amenable to mathematical treatment." Why then did he take it as the basis of his postulate, when stating that John Cabot "with a variation of one point and a half would have dropped 360 miles to the south," or that if the bold navigator "laid his course to the west by compass from latitude  $53^{\circ}$  N., a variation of one point and a half would have carried him clear of Cape Race?" Was not this alleged consequence predicated upon mathematical treatment?

Driven away from this position, Dr. Dawson appeals to "the uniformity of the laws of nature, by which we are led to assume that in whatever way the magnetic pole and curves of variation are shifting now they were shifting then, in that slow change which is still going on from year to year."

Dr. Dawson confuses two very distinct things, viz.: the uniformity of the laws of nature, by virtue of which occur around us the movements which we observe, and the uniformity of these movements. Because a movement is produced by the uniform laws of nature, it does not follow that this movement must necessarily be uniform. In nature, on the contrary, movements are exceedingly varied; as is shown constantly in astronomy, natural philosophy, and all the sciences in which movements are studied.

It is therefore inexact and unscientific, from beginning to end, to maintain that the magnetic variation at Cape Race in 1497 can be determined from the fact that "it is at present  $30^{\circ}$  west, and that the variation now at the Admiral's point of observation in 1492, is  $20^{\circ}$  west." The relative positions of the curves of equal variation between the coast of Ireland and Newfoundland at the time of

Cabot are totally unknown,<sup>1</sup> and cannot be therefore deduced from their actual position. We have only to examine on an Admiralty chart the present distribution of those curves; to see at a glance that if mentally or otherwise we move the network or entire series of them (supposing, for the experiment, that they are rigid or material) the magnetic curves which pass over any portion of the globe *will no longer bear to each other the relations which they had before we displaced the entire set of said curves*, in the manner aforesaid. Dr. Dawson therefore has not proved and cannot prove by what he calls the uniformity of the laws of nature that "Cabot in a northern parallel would, of necessity, cross the magnetic meridians in quicker succession," and still less that the total result of variation experienced by Cabot between Ireland and Newfoundland was "a point and a half."

We must now revert to Dr. Dawson's new specific theory. He says that "from the sum total of 3150 miles [given by his opponent as the length of Columbus's course from Gomera to Guanahani] must be deducted at least 672 miles, leaving a distance of 2478 miles,<sup>2</sup> because [as Dr. Dawson again alleges] it was not until he reached the longitude of 40° that the Admiral noticed a variation of a full point." He completes his postulate with the further assertion that "the length of the course should be counted, for the purpose of this argument, from the point where the disturbing influence first began to act."

But where did it first begin to act? That is the question. All we know on the subject is comprised within these few words of Columbus in his log-book: "Jueves, 13 de Setiembre. En este día, al comienzo de la noche, las agujas noruesteaban, y á la mañana noruesteaban algun tanto." The Admiral does not state, and we have no means whatever of knowing, in what meridian the westing of his compasses was thus noticed.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Dawson in support of his theory refers to Reiné's chart of 1505 (monograph of 1898, p. 161) which, he says, "shows plainly upon it, by its double scale, a variation on the Newfoundland coast of nearly two points." That will be news to the student of cartography. It is true that in one of the scales Cape Race has the latitude of 50½° N., and in the other it has the latitude of 47° N., which is nearer the truth. But neither the one nor the other has anything to do with the magnetic variation. The oblique scale is merely a graphic correction of an original error in the perpendicular one. Kohl (*Doc. Hist. of Maine*, p. 178) and Peschel (*Zeitalt. der Entdeck.*, 1858, p. 332, note 2), both of them high authorities, who describe the scale on the chart, would not have failed to notice the fact if they had ever dreamt that magnetism was at all involved in the matter. Supposing even that one or the other of these scales was intended to show a variation (which hypothesis is scarcely admissible) and that the variation was exact, it would apply only to the east coast of Newfoundland, and not to the marine space between Ireland and Newfoundland; the totality of which has to be taken into account in a computation of that sort.

<sup>2</sup> By Columbus's course, as worked out by Capt. Fox, the distance was 3105 miles; but this difference of 45 miles is insignificant.

According to the recent map produced by Dr. Dawson himself, the agonic line was met by Columbus in the meridian of about  $30^{\circ}$ . The fact that he noticed the westing of his compasses on the 13th of September<sup>1</sup> does not prove that his course until then had been constantly due west from Gomera to the meridian of  $40^{\circ}$  longitude, adopted by Dr. Dawson, and especially between  $30^{\circ}$  and  $40^{\circ}$ . This he is bound to show before assuming to deduct 672 miles from the course. Further, what we know of the matter has no other basis than Capt. Schott's above-mentioned conjectural chart, and, curious to say, it even contradicts Dr. Dawson's theory in a most important particular.

We see, for instance, from this hypothetical tracing of the line of no variation that the westing of Columbus's compasses commenced near  $30^{\circ}$  west, and went on increasing until  $40^{\circ}$ , when the Admiral noticed that the variation had reached one full point west. From  $40^{\circ}$  W., in a western course, it could but continue to increase and was more than one point until the landfall was made at Guanahani. It follows that if, according to Dr. Dawson's new theory, "the length of the course should be counted from the point where the disturbing influence first began to act," we must count, not from  $40^{\circ}$ , as Dr. Dawson now maintains, but from a meridian situated nine or ten degrees more to the eastwards, viz.: in the longitude of  $30^{\circ}$  (in round figures).

Even with the minimum length (2433 miles) assumed by him for the portion of the course which alone, he now says, experienced the variation west, we find for a linear deviation of 240 miles, an angular deviation of  $5^{\circ} 38'$ .<sup>2</sup> It follows that if with a variation of one point west ( $11^{\circ} 15'$ ) Columbus's angular deviation was  $5^{\circ} 38'$ , Cabot's angular deviation, with Dr. Dawson's alleged variation of one point and a half ( $16^{\circ} 52' 30''$ ), will be one-and-a-half times  $5^{\circ} 38'$ , or  $8^{\circ} 27'$ .

And now, what is the practical outcome of all these technical demonstrations?

<sup>1</sup> It is well to recollect that we do not possess the original complete text of Columbus's log-book. We only have an abridgment made by Bishop Las Casas, and even this was made from a mere copy, now lost.

<sup>2</sup> We know that Dr. Dawson does not like logarithms and mathematical proofs, but they cannot well be avoided at this present juncture.

Calling  $x$  the angle of deviation of the course of Columbus from the true direction east and west, this angle  $x$  is given by the relation  $\tan x = \frac{240}{2433}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Log } 240 &= 2.380211 \\ \text{Colog } 2433 &= 4.613858 \\ \text{Log } \tan x &= 2.994069 \\ x &= 5^{\circ} 36'\end{aligned}$$

This angular deviation of  $8^{\circ} 27'$  corresponds with a linear deviation of 233 miles south of the parallel of  $53^{\circ}$  latitude north, in which Cabot's magnetic course is supposed to have lain. Theoretically, this magnetic course amounted exactly to 1621 miles, Dr. Dawson to the contrary notwithstanding.<sup>1</sup> He says 1740 miles. But 1740 miles is the distance from the Irish coast in  $53^{\circ}$  latitude north to Cape Race, and the learned Canadian is simply begging the question when he sets forth *a priori* this distance of 1740 miles before having first proved that Cabot actually passed close to Cape Race; which is the gist of the problem.

Admitting therefore (still for the sake of argument) a variation of one point and a half ( $16^{\circ} 52' 30''$ ) west for Cabot, we find that the angular deviation in his course was only  $8^{\circ} 27'$ , which, as above stated, corresponds with a linear deviation of 238 miles,<sup>2</sup> instead of 360 miles alleged by our painstaking opponent. These 238 miles of linear deviation would fix Cabot's landfall at  $360 - 238 = 122$  miles more to the northwards than the landfall which Dr. Dawson strenuously advocates; as he can readily ascertain by borrowing "the chart, the ruler and the protractor" of a highly impartial and considerate Toronto critic, but making a more judicious use of the same.

In other words, the landfall of Cabot, which, according to Dr. Dawson's interpretation of 1896, was at Cape Breton, would have been (under his first theory) far up in Newfoundland, at White Bay. The landfall which, according to his interpretation of 1898, was also at Cape Breton, would have been (under his latest theory) in a very different place, viz.: in the Bay of Bonavista.

Withal, we do not wish to be understood to say that the landfall was at Bonavista rather than at Cape Breton, or anywhere else. Our sole object has been to prove that on this point Dr. Dawson erred as much in 1898 as he did in 1894 and 1896. As to our private opinion, it is that we do not know and apparently never shall know where John Cabot first sighted the New World.

## II.

So recently as 1893, Sir Clements Markham, the distinguished

<sup>1</sup> The magnetic course is the only one that should be taken into account in the computation of the linear deviation in Cabot's real course, as being the only length known, in concurrence with the tangent of the angle of deviation; and no mathematician will gainsay this.

<sup>2</sup> Calling  $x$  Cabot's linear deviation, the deviation is given by the relation

$$\begin{aligned} x &= 1600 \times \tan 8^{\circ} 27'. \\ \log \tan 8^{\circ} 27' &= 1.71899 \\ \log 1600 &= 3.204120 \\ \log x &= 2.376019 \\ x &= 237 \text{ miles } 7. \end{aligned}$$



President of the Royal Geographical Society, maintained as regards Cabot's landfall the following opinion:<sup>1</sup>

"The great value of the 1544 map of Sebastian Cabot is that it fixes the landfall of his father's first voyage; that *on this point he is the highest authority, and that his evidence is quite conclusive*, if it was given in good faith" (p. xxxiii.).

Sir Clements reached the climax as follows:

"As Sebastian Cabot had no motive for falsifying his map he did not do so, and the 'Prima Vista' [*i. e.*, Cape Breton] where he placed it, *is the true landfall of John Cabot on his first voyage*" (p. xxxiv.).

In reply, among other cogent reasons, it was urged that Sebastian did have motives for falsifying his map; that is, in placing in 1544 the landfall at Cape Breton, after having constantly, for thirty years previous, caused it to be inscribed in Labrador. These motives were that the explorations of Jacques Cartier had brought to notice a valuable region which France, then at war with England, was attempting to colonize; that Sebastian Cabot, to advance his own interest, was always engaged in plotting and corresponding in secret with foreign rulers; that so early as 1538, he was intriguing with the English ambassador in Spain to be employed by Henry VIII.; that his cartographical statements, as embodied in the 1544 map, may well have been a suggestion of British claims and a bid for the King of England's favor, considering that to place the landfall near the gulf of St. Lawrence was tantamount to declaring Cape Breton and Newfoundland (instead of bleak and worthless Labrador) to be English territory; and that in fact, a couple of years afterwards, he removed to England, where His Majesty pensioned and employed him. These reasons, which we innocently believed to be worth listening to, were unceremoniously dismissed by Sir Clements Markham as being "quite inadequate," and without his taking the trouble, as, under the circumstances, he should have done, to explain the cartographical change brought about by Sebastian Cabot. In consequence, the positive belief of Sir Clements that Cape Breton Island was Cabot's landfall remained, for the time being, unshaken.

The eminent geographer also maintained the following assertion:

"Cabot after a voyage of fifty days reached land at five o'clock in the morning of *Saturday, the 24th of June*, being St. John's Day" (p. xv.).

<sup>1</sup> *The Journal of Christopher Columbus*, Hakluyt Society Public. No. LXXXVI., 1893.

As regards the participation of Sebastian Cabot in that memorable expedition, which had been the object of grave doubts, Sir Clements expressed this opinion :

"On the whole it seems *most probable* that John Cabot did take his young son [*i. e.*, Sebastian] with him" (p. xxiv.).

We are now made to witness a sudden revolution of opinions on these important points of maritime history.

In a paper read at the Royal Geographical Society, April 12, 1897,<sup>1</sup> Sir Clements Markham frankly acknowledges that "some of his views [on the subject of the Cabots] have been modified."

This time (employing the same argument which had been advanced five years ago to batter down his advocacy of the landfall at Cape Breton, viz. : the brief account which John Cabot himself gave to Raimondo di Soncino of his voyage), Sir Clements Markham throws overboard both the Cabotian planisphere and the *Prima Vista* at that very Cape Breton. It should also be noticed that with Dr. Dawson's chief argument for proving that Cape Breton was the real landfall, Sir Clements reaches an entirely different conclusion :

"The same amount of southing," says he, "caused by the variation of the compass which took Columbus to Guanahani would have taken Cabot to Bonavista bay, and taking Soncino's account of the voyage by itself, *there can be no question that Bonavista bay, on the east coast of Newfoundland, was the landfall*" (p. 608).

Unfortunately, Sir Clements neglects to initiate us into the arcanæ of his computations. It would have proved interesting to subject them to the same *experimentum crucis* as Dr. Dawson's. Meanwhile the change of front from Cape Breton to Bonavista is already a point gained. Further on it will be shown what we are to think of this new landfall.

As to the date, Sir Clements is no longer so positive : "*It was not necessarily on June 24th,*" he now says (p. 610). With regard to his previous opinion that "*most probably*" Sebastian Cabot joined the expedition of 1497, Sir Clements at present rejects it altogether. "*Sebastian,*" says he, "*was not himself on board the Matthew ;*" adding even : "*and it is very doubtful whether he accompanied his father on either of his voyages*" (p. 612).

These departures from opinions formerly held and energetically defended by the eminent geographer deserve to be noted, particularly in connection with a recantation of the same kind which stands to the credit of Dr. Dawson. For instance, this savant has found fault with one of Cabot's biographers who, he says (most erroneously however) after fixing the landfall at Cape Breton, wrote ten years

<sup>1</sup> *The Geographical Journal*, London, June, 1897.

afterwards in favor of the coast of Labrador. Yet, himself, after believing the landfall to have been in Newfoundland,<sup>1</sup> he now places it at Cape Breton.

So far from blaming such changes of view, in this or any other historical investigation, on the part of Dr. Dawson, or on the part of Sir Clements Markham, we consider that they bespeak the true spirit of experienced and loyal historians. He is indeed a very poor student of history who imagines that the book he writes embodies the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, for all times to come. Even if every source of information had been exhausted, there would still remain the parallel evolution of kindred sciences and the faculty to appreciate, which, it is almost a truism to say, becomes keener and keener through constant exercise and a more thorough knowledge of the facts. "L' Histoire est une enquête perpétuelle." Only the wisecracks whose method and profound learning consist exclusively in collecting, as with a spoon, so to speak, the footnotes and statements of others, think otherwise.

### III.

Dr. Dawson, after publishing his interesting monograph of 1894, wrote another,<sup>2</sup> not less elaborate, which may be called an attempt at elucidating the first, and wherein new Cabotian theories are advanced. One of these concerns the fact that after causing during thirty years the landfall to be marked in Labrador or Greenland, Sebastian Cabot removed it to Cape Breton. The question involves, besides, a point of capital interest concerning the cartographical history of America. Dr. Dawson disposes of it as follows:

"Sebastian Cabot was not in truth English born, and had no patriotic obligation to guard English interests. Therefore, when he was made grand pilot of Spain, and head of the department of cartography at Seville, he quietly acquiesced in the suppression on the maps he supervised of all traces of his father's voyage and his father's discoveries for England. . . . Cabot was well recompensed by the King of Spain for the use of that knowledge of the *Bacallaos*, which he above others possessed; and that knowledge, underrated and even despised in England, was suppressed upon the Spanish and Portuguese maps. That is the answer to the question: Why, if Cabot's landfall had been really at Cape Breton in *Bacca-*

<sup>1</sup> "For many years, under the influence of current traditions and cursory reading, I believed the landfall of John Cabot to have been in Newfoundland." Dr. Dawson in *Trans. Royal Soc. Can.* for 1894, p. 55.

<sup>2</sup> *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada relative to a Cabot celebration in 1896*, Vol. II., Sec. II.; and *The Voyages of the Cabots; Latest Phases of the Controversy*, N. S., Vol. III., Sec. II., 1897.

laos, did he not record it upon the maps he supervised while grand pilot of Spain?" (monograph of 1894, p. 84).

This alleged suppression of maps is a pure invention. The English discoveries were so little suppressed in the Spanish maps, that all we know about them cartographically is to be found exclusively in Spanish maps of the time and in contemporaneous copies of them. First, before Cabot came to Spain, in La Cosa's planisphere (1500), which delineates the "*Mar descubierta por inglese*." Then, while Sebastian Cabot held the office of pilot major of Spain, in the mappemonde sent from Seville by Robert Thorne (1527), where we read: "*Terra hec ab Anglis primum fuit inventa*." Afterwards, in the Weimar Ribeiro (1529), bearing the inscription: "*Esta tierra descubrieron los Ingleses*," and in the Propaganda map (1529), which inserts the legend: "*laqual descubrieron los Ingleses de la villa de Bristol*," a statement also inscribed in the Wolfenbüttel mappemonde (circa 1530), all of which are maps openly made in Seville, most of them while Charles V. sat upon the throne and by his own chart-makers.

If Dr. Dawson's theory is sound, let him say why the Spanish royal cartographers should have inscribed the English discoveries in official charts at all? On the other hand, at that time, or at any time, what difference could it make to Spain to place the English discoveries in Greenland or in Labrador rather than at Cape Breton, if the latter was the true place? Neither the one nor the other belonged to her. Ever since 1494 those three countries had been relinquished by Spain in favor of Portugal, officially and forever. We still possess two original maps<sup>1</sup> based upon the Royal Pattern (*Padron real*) and endorsed by cosmographers of Charles V. The one, dated 1527, states that it contains all that which was discovered up to date: "*todo lo que del Mundo se a descubierto fasta aora*." The other, dated 1529, adds to this statement the following words: "according to the treaty which was entered into by the Catholic Sovereigns of Spain and King John of Portugal at Tordesillas in 1494: "*conforme a la capitulacion que hizieron los Catholicos Reyes de España y el Rey don Juan de Portugal en Tordesillas año de 1494*," and both are signed by a "*Cosmographo de Su Magestad*."

These authentic maps trace the line of demarcation between Spain and Portugal, marking with a Spanish flag the region within which westwardly the one could accomplish maritime discoveries, and with a Portuguese standard the region allotted eastwardly to the other for the same purpose.<sup>2</sup> Now, that line in those, and

<sup>1</sup> Kohl, *Die beiden ältesten General-Karten von Amerika*, Weimar, 1860, folio.

<sup>2</sup> *Alleged Partition of the Globe*, in *The Diplomatic History of America, its first chapter, 1452-1493-1494*, London, 1897, pp. 74-77.

in fact in all the Spanish maps of the sixteenth century, is made to pass through the longitude of Halifax, ascribing therefore the greatest part of Nova Scotia, the whole of Cape Breton Island and of Newfoundland, as well as the east coast of Labrador, to Portugal exclusively.

It is plain to any unbiassed mind that under the circumstances Spain had no interest whatever in making a mystery of the geographical configuration of the Atlantic borders north of the Carolinas; particularly as the *Tierra de Ayllon*, in about  $35^{\circ}$  latitude, was the extreme limit of what she claimed as her own, or attempted to colonize in that region.

Nor were the discoveries accomplished by the English a secret for any one. If the country discovered by them was Cape Breton, how is it that all the old maps and mappemondes name that region, not *Tierra de los Ingleses*, but *Tierra de los Bretones*, and even, in unmistakable language, *Terra que foy descubierta por bertomes*? Why should the Portuguese, the Catalans, the Italians, etc., who certainly had no reasons whatever for preferring the Bretons to the English, ascribe to Brittany a merit alleged to belong to England?

This legend is so deeply rooted that we must be permitted to expatiate upon its improbability. It is difficult to conceive anything more inconsistent with the records of Spanish maritime history than the assertion that Spain ever possessed geographical data concerning North America, of which other nations knew nothing, and which it was a crime to disclose in maps. In those days, the Castilian kings (to whom alone the Indies belonged, Aragon having no share in them) made known all their public orders not verbally, but by written ordinances (*cédulas*) duly promulgated. And it must be said that no monarchs in Europe indulged in the practice more than they did. We still possess all the prohibitions of a public character and decrees enacted by them. If there had even existed under their reign a law making it unlawful to communicate maps of the newly-discovered regions, we should certainly find it in one at least of the numerous *Recopilaciones de Leyes*, particularly among their elaborate and minute clauses relative to nautical matters.<sup>1</sup> Now there is not a single one containing the least trace of anything of the kind.<sup>2</sup> Nor did any searcher ever find in the records of the Casa de Contratacion a single case of pilots or seamen, or mer-

<sup>1</sup> Besides the *Recopilaciones*, see Veytia *Linage, Norte de la Contratacion*, Seville, 1672, folio.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Dawson says: "In 1511 an edict was issued forbidding the communication of charts to foreigners" (monograph of 1894, p. 68). This edict exists only in the learned Canadian's imagination.

chants, or underwriters, or cartographers having been molested on that account.<sup>1</sup>

On the contrary, a number of examples could be cited to prove how great was the immunity regarding the communication of maps, even to foreigners. For instance, the greatest events in the naval history of Spain are the discoveries of Columbus and Magellan. Isabella and Charles V. well knew that Venice beheld those new seaways as bespeaking the downfall of her commercial influence in the far East. Still, when Angelo Trivigiano asked of Columbus, for the use of the celebrated Venetian Admiral Domenico Malipiero, a map of the newly-discovered regions, the great Genoese at once sent his own copy to Palos, to have a perfect and complete reproduction made by a pilot of the place: "*fata et copiosa, et particular di quanto paese è stato scoperto.*"<sup>2</sup> As to the all-important strait discovered by Magellan, it was openly disclosed and delineated, with the exact route, in maps and globes supplied by Maximilianus Transylvanus, the secretary of Charles V.<sup>3</sup> Yet, *a priori*, what required more to be kept secret than the way to the Spice Islands?

Furthermore, the advocates of the theory that geographical data were withheld by Spain, should first show in what respects any of the numerous Spanish maps of the time which we possess, and which set forth North American configurations, omit anything of importance that was then known. Peter Martyr, Las Casas, Oviedo, the mass of letters patent and judicial inquests concerning the transatlantic discoveries, etc., etc., state in detail the objects and results of Spanish voyages to the Indies, as America was then called. Not a single topographical datum worth recording can be pointed out as having been omitted in any of the semi-official Sevillian maps which have reached us. Nor is there one which does not contain all that the Casa de Contratacion, with its means of information, could then know. This fact will not be gainsaid by any one at all familiar with the Spanish archives and cartography. And as regards the northeast coast, if those charts servilely set forth the delineations, and even the very nomenclature of the Portuguese portulans, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is

<sup>1</sup> As to the argument of Dr. Dawson upon a passage from a letter sent from Seville in 1527 by Robert Thorne with a map to Dr. Lee, see the *Discovery of North America by John Cabot*, 3d edit., pp. 20, 21.

<sup>2</sup> Letter "Ex Granata die 21 Aug. 1501," in *Christophe Colomb*, Vol. II., p. 119. The original MS. of those highly interesting letters was discovered only five years ago in the library of Mr. Sneyd at Newcastle.

<sup>3</sup> *De Moluccis insulis, Coloniae, 1523*, and Epistle addressed by Schöner to Reymers von Streypbergk, in Wieser's *Magalhães-Strasse*, Innsbruck, 1881.



because Spain possessed no other source of information, and, consequently, she had nothing whatever to conceal in that respect.<sup>1</sup>

In keeping with all those legends, is the following statement of Dr. Dawson: "One fact stares us in the face at the outset, that while maps were freely engraved and printed in all parts of Italy, Germany and France, none were printed in Spain" (monograph of 1898, p. 187).

To interpret this fact as showing "how effectually the Council of the Indies had concealed the cartographical records of their office," Dr. Dawson should commence by proving that the absence of American maps of Spanish make was an exception and that the Spaniards engraved and printed maps of Spain or of other countries at that time. This has not yet been shown by anybody. The plain reason is that no maps of America, and in fact no maps at all, were engraved or printed in Spain before the second half of the sixteenth century;<sup>2</sup> simply because at that time the art of engraving maps, particularly on copper, did not yet exist in that country, as was also the case in England and Portugal.

#### IV.

Now comes the question of Sebastian Cabot's character as a cosmographer, a scientist, a navigator and a man, which, it must be said, is at present somewhat damaged. Dr. Dawson meets a mass of documentary proofs, absolutely authentic, with an argument which he doubtless believes to be decisive, viz.:

"Ferdinand and Charles V. were good judges of men, and they trusted Sebastian Cabot to the last" (monograph of 1898, p. 182).

Even if it were so (for the word "trusted" is not generally synonymous with "employed"), what of it? History teems with instances of famous kings and great emperors, all "good judges of men," who were, nevertheless, imposed upon by charlatans to the last. How many crowned heads and important personages, as well as lesser ones, do we not see at all times and everywhere deluded by the fallacious promise held out to them of converting the baser metals into pure gold? For Ferdinand and Charles V., for Henry VII. and the advisers of Edward VI., even for Queen Mary,<sup>3</sup> the

<sup>1</sup> See Oviedo, *Historia General de las Indias*, Vol. II., p. 148. He was state chronicler of the Indies and wrote on the subject of American cartography, shortly after 1541.

<sup>2</sup> The only map of Spanish make known to have been engraved in Spain before 1545, is a rough and small wood-cut inserted in the second or third issue of the 1511 edition of Peter Martyr's *First Decade*. Even the map in Medina's *Arte de Navegar* (1545) is only a rough and badly executed wood-cut, scarcely any better than Peter Martyr's.

<sup>3</sup> Richard Willes, speaking of Sebastian Cabot's map which the Earl of Bedford had at Chenies, says: "In his card drawn with his own hand, the mouth of the North-

philosopher's stone was the discovery of a North-West Passage to Cathay; and it was by making those monarchs believe that he positively knew of the existence of such a passage, first in the Baccalaos region (1512), then at the south (1525), and finally towards the North Pole (1553), that Sebastian Cabot prospered both in Spain and in England, after having vainly endeavored to deceive the Republic of Venice (1523 and 1551) by the same pretence.

"This man," again says Dr. Dawson (ironically), "served some of the most capable princes who ever sat upon a throne, and it remained after 350 years for us to find him out" (monograph of 1897, p. 184).

Just as if there was a time of prescription for mistakes and delusions, or as if the real estimate of Sebastian Cabot's character, under every aspect, was not based altogether upon authentic documents! To a blind admiration, which has no other source than stereotyped averments of suspicious origin and constantly repeated, without control and without proofs, critical historians oppose Sebastian Cabot's own writings and theories. These are amply sufficient to form a correct opinion of his professional and scientific worth. They have been recently examined—for the first time in three centuries—with care and impartiality. Let the champions and admirers *quand même* of Sebastian Cabot come forward and refute, not with legends, with empty words or with oburgations, but by dint of facts and figures, if they can, the opinion formed by painstaking critics of the wily Venetian's value as a commander and a seaman,<sup>1</sup> as a pretended discoverer in magnetics,<sup>2</sup> as an expert in nautical science,<sup>3</sup> nay as a cosmographer.<sup>4</sup> Let them endeavor, if it be within their reach, to trace back to him the least invention or progress in maritime devices or applications; let them even show any act or effort on his part which ever proved beneficial to anything or to any one beside himself.

As to his private character, it is worse still.<sup>5</sup> We will not

Western Strait lieth near the 318 meridian, between 61° and 64° in elevation, continuing the same breadth about ten degrees West, where it openeth Southerly more and more." *History of Travayle*, 1577, p. 232. According to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Sebastian even boasted having "entered the same fret until he came to the septentrional latitude of 67½ degrees."

<sup>1</sup> Documents in *John Cabot, the Discoverer of North America*, pp. 227-255, 412-427; and Drapeyron's *Revue de Géographie*, Nov., 1897.

<sup>2</sup> Docs. in *John Cabot, etc.*, pp. 290-295, 296-308.

<sup>3</sup> Docs. in *op. cit.*, pp. 309-317, 454-456.

<sup>4</sup> Docs. in *op. cit.*, pp. 281-288, and Drapeyron's *Revue*, 1897.

<sup>5</sup> Every document which we now discover continues to tell against Sebastian Cabot's honesty in some way or other. As a professional cartographer, see how he acted toward the Fuggers. We read the following entry in their books, lately brought to light: "Sebastian Gabato, a cosmographer. Loss suffered on his account. He was to make a map-

again enlarge on this topic, further than by expressing our surprise at the sort of ethics now employed to whitewash Sebastian Cabot. To cite a single example.

In 1522, when Magellan's companions had returned to Spain and brought news of the discovery of the southern strait, all the technical details of which had been communicated to Sebastian Cabot by virtue of his office as pilot major, he concocted a plan, which, had it been realizable, would have set at naught the results of that great deed and proved extremely prejudicial to Spain. He called repeatedly on the Venetian ambassador, proposing to carry into effect schemes concerning the spice trade for the Signory's benefit; and finally sent an agent secretly to Venice to proffer his services. Contarini, the ambassador at Valladolid, was at once instructed to confer with Cabot. The official despatch relating the interview is extremely dramatic and exhibits in a vivid light the character of the man.

They met at night. The information that the Signory hearkened to his treacherous proposals elated him. Suddenly, he became alarmed, turned pale and, quaking with fear,<sup>1</sup> besought the ambassador never to divulge the matter, as otherwise "it would cost him his life." The fact is that if Charles V. had been informed of such a plot, the disloyal pilot major would soon have found his way to the gallows.

Cabot, to enhance the reward which he expected to receive from Venice, took pains to inform Contarini that Ferdinand had made him a captain with a salary of 50,000 maravedis, had subsequently given him the office of pilot major with an additional salary of 50,000 maravedis and 25,000 besides as a gratuity. Then, to show, in his own peculiar way, his gratitude to Spain, he proposed to lead a Venetian fleet to Cathay or to the Spice Islands through a passage which he pretended to have discovered: "come e il vero che io l'ho ritrovato." Is it not plain that if such a knowledge existed, its disclosure belonged, as of right, to the government which employed and paid him and should never have been imparted by the pilot major of Spain to a rival nation? Every impartial his-

pemonde for us. He never did, and notwithstanding repeated efforts we have been unable to recover the money we had paid him for it, viz.: 2250 maravedis." "1553. He left Spain to go to England, and we do not know whether he is still alive. Loss for George Stecher, 2250 mrs." Konrad Haebler, *Zeitschrift der Gesellsch. f. Erdkunde zu Berlin*, Bd. XXX., 1895.

<sup>1</sup> "Li detti la lettera, lui la lesse et legiendola si mosse tutto di colore. Da poi letta, stete cussi un pocheto senza dirmi altro quasi sbigotito et dubio . . . ma vi prego quanto posso che la cosa sij secreta perche a me anderebbe la vita." Dispatch of Contarini, Dec. 31, 1522, in Rawdon Brown's *Calendar*, Vol. III., p. 607, seq.

torian must acknowledge Sebastian Cabot to have shown himself, on that occasion at least, both an impostor and a traitor.

Not so, however, with a certain Italian commentator, who declares this course and repeated acts of the same kind on the part of Cabot to have been perfectly legitimate and admirable. As to Dr. Dawson, having in mind either the present instance of treachery, or one precisely like it attempted by Cabot against England when in the employ of Edward VI., he meekly observes that "it must be remembered how common it was in those days for sailors to pass from the service of one prince into that of another, and necessarily some negotiations must have preceded every such transfer" (monograph of 1897, p. 185). The less said about this explanation the better.

## V.

In connection with Cabot's quatercentenary, the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava delivered a patriotic address in Bristol<sup>1</sup> and wrote an elaborate article for a New York magazine.<sup>2</sup> They are such as to prompt the supposition that, being absorbed by official duties, his Lordship, who is a distinguished man of letters, not having time to make the required searches himself, may have entrusted to some one else the task of preparing the material for his eloquent Cabotian disquisitions. At all events, the monograph contains a number of historical novelties and, to say the least, questionable averments. Let us cite a few :

"Cabot successfully negotiated for King Henry an agreement with the King of Denmark in reference to matters affecting the English trade in Ireland."

This statement occurs for the first time in Anspach's *History of Newfoundland*, written so recently as 1819 (p. 25), and is supported by no authority whatever. Further, there are no traces of anything of the kind in a single known document, printed or manuscript, whether in England or in Denmark or in the *Hanseerecsse*, which should contain information on the subject if the statement was true.

"Sebastian Cabot was born in Bristol."

He said so to Eden, in his old age, in England ; but it is one of the many falsehoods uttered by him whenever it was to his interest. To be a grantee of letters patent under the Tudors, as well as now, it was necessary to be of full age ; that is, 21 years old. As Sebastian figures as grantee in the letters patent of March 5, 1496, conjointly with his father and brothers as second son, he was

<sup>1</sup> *London Times*, June 27, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> *Scribner's Magazine*, July, 1897, pp. 72-75.

then not less than twenty-two, and came to life consequently before March 1474. Now, John Cabot was made a Venetian citizen on March 28, 1476, "in consequence of a constant residence of fifteen years next preceding" in Venice:—"per habitationem annorum XV, juxta consuetudinem." Sebastian Cabot therefore was born in that city; further, that was the general opinion everywhere.

When the great liveries of London objected to Sebastian being put in command of an English expedition, they intimated to the King and to Cardinal Wolsey, on March 1, 1521, that "he was not naturally born within the realm of England." When he treacherously offered his services to the Republic of Venice, his agent represented to the Council of Ten, in September 1522, that Sebastian was "*di questa città nostra*." He himself told Gasparo Contarini, the Venetian ambassador at the court of Charles V., on December 30, 1522, "To tell everything to Your Lordship, I was born in Venice, but brought up in England:—Signor Ambassator, *per dirve il tutto io naqui a Venetia ma sum nutrito in Inghilterra*." Peter Martyr, Navagero, Oviedo, Ramusio, the "Mantua Gentleman," Soranzo, all men of great veracity and high character, who derived their information from his own lips, always call Sebastian Cabot "Venetiano." How can any one presume to set up against this array of positive admissions and logical deductions from authentic documents, the unsupported and solitary statement made to Eden by Sebastian that he was an Englishman by birth, although he represented himself to the envoy of Venice so late as 1551 as a Venetian born?

"*Before his arrival in Bristol*, John Cabot's reputation as an experienced seaman and navigator had been fully recognized."

This novel piece of information rests upon no evidence whatever.

"The more probable conjecture, as well as an *unbroken local tradition*, points to Cape Bonavista, in Newfoundland, as the first land seen."

The word "conjecture" is too elastic to be of much weight in an inquiry of this character. Nor is it, by far, "the more probable." Biddle, Humboldt and Kohl (the latter with the 1544 map before him) conjectured that Labrador was the landfall. Dr. Dawson conjectures that it is Cape Breton; others conjecture that it must be located in Greenland, and even at Salem Neck. As to the "unbroken local tradition" invoked by Lord Dufferin, Dr. Dawson justly makes the following remark: "A tradition presupposes settlers on the coast to hand it down. But there were no settlers for a hundred years after Cabot; the Indians all perished, and when living, their relations with Europeans were relations of hatred and

aversion. Even their language perished with them." Besides, John Cabot himself says that he did not see a single living soul: "non a visto persona alguna." Who then could have started the alleged "tradition?" But let us not be too skeptical. This "unbroken tradition" may have been transmitted by the ghosts who were often heard conversing:—"muchas vezes oyen hablar spiritus," according to the ninth legend of Cabot's map.

We also notice the following asseveration: "The conception of an intermediate continent [between Europe and Asia] was absent from the mind of Cabot as it was from that of Columbus." His Lordship then says: "In fact, Cabot's notion was that of a north-west passage."

What for? It stands to reason that if the Atlantic Ocean bathed the shores of Asia, there would have been no necessity on the part of Cabot, or any one else, to go in search of a northwestern strait to reach the Asiatic regions.

"In 1526, Sebastian Cabot set out on an important expedition, whose object was the exploration of the Pacific Ocean, but, owing to the dissatisfaction of his subordinates, this intention was frustrated, and Cabot put into La Plata."

The intention was frustrated because Sebastian Cabot, who showed himself a very poor seaman, and apparently had never led a maritime expedition before, went headlong into the "Black pot,"<sup>1</sup> contrarily to the repeated advice of his pilots. In consequence, after a series of professional mishaps, he lost his flagship in the channel of St. Catherine, which shipwreck decided the fate of the enterprise. On his return to Spain, Cabot, for this and other misdemeanors, was arrested and tried by the Council of the Indies, which found him guilty each time in four successive trials, and sentenced him to four years' banishment in a penal colony in Africa.

"His attempts to found a colony did not prove successful, on account of quarrels with the natives, which in some measure owed their origin to an indigenous chief having fallen in love with the wife of one of his officers."

This extraordinary love-story is a fabrication of the whole cloth (not by His Lordship, however). No officer had his wife with him; nay, no woman whatever accompanied or joined Cabot's expedition at any time.

"Sebastian Cabot threw up the enterprise, and returning to England, made his permanent home among us."

Sebastian Cabot returned direct to Spain in July, 1530, where he was forbidden to absent himself from Ocaña, a town of Castile.

<sup>1</sup> See the map in Drapeyron's *Revue de Géographie* for November, 1897.



He did not return to England until eighteen years afterwards, in 1548.

"In 1549 Edward the Sixth gave him the title of Grand Pilot."

Sebastian Cabot never was grand pilot of England. The office did not even exist in the time of Edward the Sixth—Hakluyt to the contrary notwithstanding. It was created about six years after the death of Sebastian Cabot, on January 3, 1563, by Queen Elizabeth, and Stephen Burrough was the first incumbent.

"Before the [second] expedition was ready John Cabot died, leaving the new adventure to be prosecuted by his son . . . Sebastian Cabot started from Bristol in May 1498 with a fleet of five vessels."

There is not a shadow of evidence that John Cabot died before May 1498 and that his son Sebastian sailed then or at any time from Bristol with a fleet. Nay, the name of Sebastian Cabot was not uttered in England in connection with the voyage until March 11, 1521, when the wardens of the great liveries of London expressed the prevailing opinion on the subject in a memorial addressed to the king, to Cardinal Wolsey and to the royal council in these words: "Sebastyan, as we here say, was neuer in that land hymself, all if he maks reporte of many things as he hath hard his father and other men speke in tymes past."<sup>1</sup>

As to the alleged death of John Cabot before the second expedition sailed out, it is interesting to note that the redeeming trait in Lord Dufferin's displays of historic lore is his disclosure of a customs roll showing that John Cabot received payment for a tally of £20, either in London or in Bristol, between September 1497 and September 1498. To all appearances this record is no less than the long-sought documentary proof that John Cabot had safely returned to England from his second voyage in the autumn of 1498, and therefore had not died in April or May next, inasmuch as a similar payment has since been found to have been made to John Cabot in 1499.<sup>2</sup>

## VI.

The Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, believing doubtless that he was pleading *pro domo sua*, has imagined, in connection with the quater-

<sup>1</sup> Every new document which comes to light substantiates the opinion now entertained by impartial historians on the subject. In the *Geografia y Descripcion Universal de las Indias, desde 1571-1574*, of Juan Lopez de Velasco, cosmographer and chronicler of the Indies under Juan de Ovando (Madrid, 1894, p. 170), we read: "Y Sebastian Gabot dicen que la costee hasta 67 grados a costa del rey de Inglaterra, *sin haber hecho nada en el descubrimiento* :—Sebastian Gabot says that he ranged the coast as far as 67° at the cost of the King of England, [yet] without ever having had anything to do with the discovery."

AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW for April 1898, pp. 449-455.

centenary, a remarkable theory regarding the origin of the Cabots.<sup>1</sup>

According to that ethnological lucubration, all individuals in Europe called Cabot or Chabot, or possessing a name resembling one or the other of these, constitute, so to speak, a separate race of human beings.<sup>2</sup> It is surprising that the author should have stopped there. To make his demonstration more convincing he ought to have added that as mankind is divided into distinct races, the Caucasian, the Mongolian, the African, the Shemitic, etc., ethnographers should add to the list the race just found out, viz.: the Cabotian, Gabatian or Chabotian *ad libitum*.

This Cabotian or Chabotian species, we are told, "probably came down in the wake of Rolf the Ganger and settled in the island of Jersey." To establish his postulate, the Hon. Cabot Lodge has ingeniously lighted upon an ichthyological argument well calculated to startle ethnographers and historians, viz.:

"*Chabot* is the name of a little fish, and as it is a fish caught in the neighborhood of the islands of Jersey, it was a very natural emblem."

This Chabot, we regret to say, is only *Cottus gobio*,<sup>3</sup> a fresh-water fish which is extremely common in all the streams of Europe from Italy to Sweden. It may therefore have been also "a very natural emblem" in twenty countries, at least, and not in one exclusively, as is, for instance, the big salamander in Japan.

To make his position stronger, the learned senator advances this other curious piece of ratiocination:

"*Chabot* means also a kind of fish and a measure, and seems to be peculiar in this way to the island of Jersey" (pp. 736-7).

This "peculiarity" is shared with a number of other localities; and were it even otherwise, it would not prove anything. *Chabot* means a certain little fish, but it means also a vine-branch (Sainte-Palaye), particularly in Berry. It has likewise the meaning of a certain kind of toy-top (Godefroy). At Valognes and in Cherbourg *chabot* is the term used to designate half a bushel, just as in Jersey. And as there are in those countries plenty of the small fish called *chabot*, the honorable senator is bound to admit that the Chabotians first came, with or without "Rolf the Ganger," not

<sup>1</sup> *The Home of the Cabots, in the Nineteenth Century* for May, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> "The Cabots were a numerous race. We find them scattered all over Europe; the name varied a little here and there; but it is always easily identified." *Op. cit.*, p. 736.

<sup>3</sup> By comparing the plate in Rondelet (Lyon, 1558, fol.) with the arms of the Cabots in Father Anselme's *Histoire Généalogique*, edit. of 1726-33, it is seen that *Cottus gobio*, Lin., is intended. As to the extensive habitat of the fish, see Desmarests in Chenu, and Valenciennes in D'Orbigny.

only to Jersey, but also to all countries where there are or have been human beings called Chabot and at the same time the little fish in question, as well as to all countries in which vine-twigs and toy-tops called *chabots* co-exist with the personal name of Chabot. Another ingenious tenet is the following :

"The same name and the same arms constitute a proof of identity" (p. 737).

That is, as the Cabots and Chabots all belong to the same "race," they possess or should possess the same arms. This, the Hon. Cabot Lodge has yet to show. Meanwhile, if the Chabots of Poitou bear "d'or à trois chabots de gueules," the Chabots of Torrettes in the county of Nice, and those of Sonville in Gâtinais bear "d'azur à une étoile d'or chargée d'une tour de gueules." The Chabots of Uzès bear "d'azur à un chevron d'or posé en pal;" Michel Cabot of Brittany bore "d'or à trois têtes de léopards de sable," with no "chabots" whatever in any of them, etc., etc.

Besides, this heraldic theory requires first of all the proof that the seafaring Cabots bore "d'or à trois chabots de gueules." Unfortunately, it so happens that neither John nor Sebastian is known to have ever possessed arms of any kind. The distinguished American senator fancies that he can overcome the difficulty by attempting to connect John Cabot and Sebastian Cabot with the French Cabots de la Fare,<sup>1</sup> who, gratuitously, claim to descend from Lewis Cabot. But it has been demonstrated<sup>2</sup> that this pretension is based entirely upon words of mouth, uttered, so far as documents go, for the first time so recently as 1829.<sup>3</sup> What is more, the assumption is based upon a pretended will, which never was produced, which does not exist, and which is represented to have been drawn by a notary of Alais said to be called Pierre Petit, although there never was at Alais or anywhere else a notary of that name.

As to the motto *Semper cor, caput Cabot*, which the Hon. Cabot Lodge sets forth as the device of Cabotians or Chabotians, and as an infallible means of identifying them, the Cabots de la Fare, upon whom he relies exclusively, themselves confess that it was not coined before the middle of the sixteenth century, and not in Jersey, but in Languedoc.

<sup>1</sup> The authority for this statement can only be the *Armorial de la Noblesse de Languedoc*, of Mr. L. de la Roque, which, as regards the Cabots of that province, is based exclusively upon the *ex parte* and uncorroborated assertion contained in the brief cited below.

<sup>2</sup> *John Cabot the Discoverer of North America*, pp. 382-384; a work which the Hon. Senator feigns to ignore.

<sup>3</sup> *Cour Royale de Nîmes. Plaidoyer pour M.M. Cabot de la Fare contre le Cardinal de la Fare*. Nîmes, Imprimerie de la Cour Royale, Juillet 1829, p. 31.

The most celebrated and oldest Chabots known are the Chabots of Poitou, where, according to Father Anselme—the highest authority in such matters—they have been known since 1040. The device of the head of the family in the first half of the sixteenth century, the famous Philippe de Chabot, Admiral de Brion, was *Concussus surgo*. Finally, among the Cabots who are the object of the Quatercentenary, the only one who possessed a device was Sebastian, and this device did not read *Semper cor, caput Cabot*, but *Spes in Deo est*.

## VII.

To complete the series of Cabotian vagaries it would prove interesting to describe an extraordinary method of solving the cartographical and philological problems involved in the question, and lately exhibited in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Canada*.<sup>1</sup> But we must forego this recreation, to sum up the facts relating to the Cabots which have been absolutely ascertained, and the drift of opinion concerning the rest.

The outcome is about as follows :

John Cabot was of Genoese origin, and a Venetian merely by adoption. His son Sebastian was not born in Bristol, but in Venice.

The American continent was discovered not in 1494 but in 1497, and it cannot be said with certainty that the date of June 24 is exact.

The discoverer was John Cabot, and not his son Sebastian, who is now believed not to have been even on board. As to the ship's name the "Matthew," it rests upon a very doubtful authority.

The landfall was neither Bonavista Bay nor Cape Breton Island, so far as evidence goes. Nor was it Cape Chidley, which, however, has not been mentioned otherwise than as the supposed *terminus* of the coasting in 1497.

All we know concerning the second voyage is that in the company of John Cabot's ship, "rigged by the Kynges grace went 3 or 4 moo owte of Bristowe, whereyn dyuers merchauntes as well of London as Bristow aventured goodes and sleight merchaundises, which departed from the West countrey in the begynnyng of Somer 1498." We also know that the fleet had taken supplies for one year, although it was expected back in England in September following, and that it encountered a great storm not far from the coast of Ireland, in consequence of which one of the vessels was disabled and left behind. Finally, we now possess documents tending to show that the previsions of Puebla and Ayala were realized and that John Cabot returned safely to Bristol before September 29, 1498.

<sup>1</sup> Second Series, 1897-1898, Vol. III., pp. cxvi.-cxxxii.

As to the rest, whether found in the *Decades* of Peter Martyr, in the legend of the map of 1544, in Ramusio, or in the 1580 edition of Stow's chronicle and the like, it has no other source, direct or indirect, than what Sebastian chose to relate or invent, and his assertions stand uncorroborated to this day. The contradictions, anachronisms and unquestionable mendacity of the man should deter serious historians from making his statements a basis for their arguments, particularly as to what belongs to the first voyage, or what pertains to the second; considering that Sebastian Cabot never speaks but of one only, mixing perhaps the details of the two expeditions, and without our being able to separate the grain from the chaff, supposing that it is not all chaff.

There is no evidence of any kind that he ever aided the Merchants Adventurers in their struggle with the Steel Yard, the downfall of which proved so beneficial to English manufacture. Nor does he deserve the credit, given to him by certain modern writers, of having initiated the British trade with Russia. That important result was due entirely to the foresight, enterprise and pluck of Richard Chancellor, and was won in spite of the instructions which he and Willoughby had received from Sebastian Cabot.

Sebastian Cabot was an inferior mariner, cosmographer, cartographer and scientist generally, who never discovered the variation or the declination of the compass, as many people believe, or the least thing in magnetics; still less the means of finding the longitude at sea, by divine revelation, as he pretended, or otherwise.

Nor is the astute Italian "the author of the maritime strength of England, who opened the way to those improvements which have rendered the English so great, so eminent, so flourishing a people." The extensive researches instituted for the last fifty years in the numerous naval archives and public records of Great Britain have failed to bring out a single indication, however faint, of his ever having had a hand in the maritime progress of England under the Tudors.

To conclude: So far from the encomiums lavished by modern historians on Sebastian Cabot being true, it is proved beyond cavil and sophistry that he was only an unmitigated charlatan, a mendacious and unfilial boaster, a would-be traitor to Spain, a would-be traitor to England.

*"On ne doit aux morts que la vérité."*

HENRY HARRISSE.

## SPAIN AND THE UNITED STATES IN 1795

"SPAIN," says Henry Adams, "had immense influence over the United States; but it was the influence of the whale over its captors—the charm of a huge, helpless and profitable victim."<sup>1</sup> The simile may serve to illustrate the temporary interest which the people of the United States have felt from time to time in the condition of the Spanish empire, but it wholly fails to represent either the real relations of the two countries, or the point of view from which the historian must contemplate their development during the past one hundred and forty years. Throughout that period it is profoundly true that events in Spain have exercised, as they are now exercising, an immense though intermittent influence upon our life. The motives which have shaped the policy of that nation—the causes which have operated upon the acts of her rulers—are well worthy of painstaking study by those who would truly comprehend the history of the United States, and much patient enquiry is still needful before all the forces and all the springs of action are laid bare. Even when the facts are fully known, many things will doubtless remain obscure, for no foreigner may ever hope quite to grasp the workings of the Spanish mind.

It is the purpose of this article to suggest, in the most general way, the manner in which and the extent to which the course of events in Spain affected the early settlement and growth of that part of the United States which lies east of the Mississippi and west of the Alleghanies—a region now embracing ten states, and inhabited by some twenty-five millions of people.

The disputed title to this vast and fruitful *Hinterland* had caused a long and world-wide and bloody war, which was terminated by the cession to Great Britain of the whole of North America east of the Mississippi, except only the island of New Orleans. New Orleans and what lay west of the great river was ceded to Spain. And thus Spain and England, representing then as now the extremes of opposing tendencies in European civilization, were set face to face to solve the problems of this continent. It was the Latin race against the Anglo-Saxon, autocracy against liberalism, reaction against progress, darkness against light.

<sup>1</sup> *History of the United States*, I. 340.



The territorial arrangements of 1763, so delicately adjusted for Europe, Asia and America, and which had been intended to secure a firm and lasting peace forever, were rudely disturbed thirteen years later by the revolt of the British North American colonies. France saw in that great event chiefly an opportunity of crippling her ancient enemy. In Spain it awakened hopes of regaining Gibraltar and of consolidating and extending her American possessions. The policy of both France and Spain was purely selfish. There was, indeed, in the former country some popular sentiment in favor of America; but neither love for British colonists nor approval of revolutionary movements, were motives which influenced in the smallest degree the cabinets of Versailles or of Madrid.

Spain was particularly reluctant to favor the American cause. It was only at the repeated and urgent solicitation of France, and after a futile attempt at mediation with England, that she consented to join in the contest. Even then, she fought solely for her own advantage, and the fear of her treachery to the common cause constantly hampered the French diplomacy. Moreover, while Spain enlisted as an enemy to Great Britain, she never became an ally of the United States. Not only did she carefully abstain from acknowledging our independence, but she was in some sense distinctly hostile, and this for reasons which were not then very clearly apprehended.

The moral influence of a successful colonial revolt was no doubt dreaded by the rulers of the nation which then possessed the greatest colonies of the world; but a far more efficient motive of hostility was the desire to perpetuate her settled commercial policy. For nearly three centuries Spain had adhered to the principle of prohibiting any trade whatever between her colonies and foreign countries. Other nations adopted a like policy, but Spain carried it to extremes. She regulated the colonial trade from the Peninsula in the minutest details. The number of ships was limited. The composition of their cargoes and the time of their sailing was prescribed. A single home port enjoyed a monopoly of the business. And all foreigners were rigidly excluded from the colonies. Spain herself was scarcely more hostile to external influence.

The inevitable result of this system was to encourage the wealth and enterprise of other nations to engage in a contraband trade with the Spanish colonies, until—like blockade-running from the Bahamas in 1864—the trade came to be conducted upon orderly principles and rose to the level of a reputable commercial business. It would have required a sincere abandonment of most cherished traditions to deal effectively with a condition of affairs in which law-

breaking was made so profitable and so respectable ; but of this the Spanish statesmen of that day were not capable. Instead, they regretfully temporized. Monopolies were partially given up and trade to some of the colonies was thrown open by degrees to all Spanish merchants. But even as late as 1778 the annual fleet of plate ships sailed for Vera Cruz.

Thus in 1779, when Spain at last declared war against Great Britain, the old order was passing away, although it still remained an open question whether any further concessions would be needed. The answer to that question depended upon the control of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea. It was only since the English had possessed the Floridas that any reforms whatever had been required, and if the English could only be excluded from those seas, it was felt in Madrid that unwelcome changes might yet be avoided. The steady growth of the contraband trade quite failed to convince the Spanish government that a permanent blockade of the coasts of two continents was impracticable. Their increasing effort was only to make it more effective, and it was believed that one important step was the acquisition of outlying foreign possessions, so as to keep foreigners at a distance both by land and sea. More and more the policy of isolation from foreign influences—spiritual, literary or mercantile—tended to become the last word of Spanish colonial statesmanship.

Florida Blanca, the Spanish prime minister, always kept these objects steadily in mind. The treaty of April 12, 1779, between France and Spain, which bound the latter to declare war against England, explicitly laid down the ends which His Catholic Majesty expected to attain by prosecuting the war. They were :

1. The restoration of Gibraltar.
2. The cession of Mobile.
3. The restoration of Pensacola and East Florida.
4. The expulsion of the English from Honduras.
5. The revocation of the privilege granted to the English of cutting dye-wood on the coast of Campeche.
6. The restoration of Minorca.

The conversion of the Gulf of Mexico into a Spanish lake was therefore the cardinal principle of the Spanish government in all dealings affecting the United States. And this principle necessarily carried with it the corollary that the Mississippi River must be closed to all foreign commerce. No such right of joint navigation as Great Britain enjoyed under the treaty of 1763 was to be tolerated. "With some degree of warmth" Florida Blanca declared to John Jay in 1780 that unless Spain could exclude all nations from

the Gulf of Mexico, she might as well admit all, and that for this reason the King would never relinquish the navigation of the Mississippi. He himself, he added, regarded that as the principal object to be attained by the war with England. If that were but secured, he should be perfectly easy whether or no Spain obtained any other cession. He regarded it as far more important than the acquisition of Gibraltar.<sup>1</sup>

The tenacity with which Spain clung to these views was not understood by Americans. The colonists who had revolted against the selfish and grasping colonial policy of Great Britain were the last people in the world to see with the eyes of those who were endeavoring to perpetuate a far more odious system. Gouverneur Morris, almost alone among American statesmen, comprehended the Spanish motives. "The only reason the Spaniards had for withholding the navigation of the Mississippi River was from the apprehension of a contraband trade," was his remark years afterwards,<sup>2</sup> for even Morris, clear-sighted as he was, did not perceive this at first. The French authorities also, although with far better means of knowledge, only grasped by degrees the full extent of the Spanish purposes. In sending their first diplomatic agent to the United States, the French government attempted to explain the conditions upon which Spain would probably enter the alliance. "There is reason to believe," said Vergennes, "that she would wish to acquire the Floridas, a share in the Newfoundland fisheries, and Jamaica."<sup>3</sup> There was no hint here of closing the Mississippi. Nor was the omission due to any aversion on the part of France to such a policy. On the contrary, as soon as the Spanish demands were made known, the French representatives in America were quite ready to urge upon Congress—often with more zeal than discretion—the importance of yielding everything that was asked.

However, the close of the Revolutionary War came and found nothing settled. The Spanish forces had seized the little British posts along the Mississippi, and at Pensacola and Mobile, and to that extent they had strengthened their position in the negotiations for peace. But they had never recognized the independence of the United States. Jay, after a residence of more than two years in Madrid, had accomplished nothing. He had only carried away with him a promise that instructions for framing a treaty should be sent to the Spanish ambassador in France, and immediately on reaching Paris, he had made an attempt to renew the negotiation ;

<sup>1</sup> *Diplomatic Corr. of the Amer. Rev.* (ed. 1889), IV. 146.

<sup>2</sup> *Diary, &c., of Gouverneur Morris*, I. 347.

<sup>3</sup> Instructions to Gerard, March 29, 1778. Doniol, III. 155.

but he there found new obstacles, to which the attitude of the French government now plainly contributed.

The fact was that the efforts of that court had for a long time been directed towards getting into their own hands the control of the peace negotiations, and they believed themselves to have succeeded. Spain was certain to be amenable. Congress had instructed its commissioners not to insist on the boundaries which had at first been treated as indispensable—not to undertake anything without the knowledge and concurrence of the French government—and ultimately to be governed by their advice and opinion. Even then, the task of the French Foreign Office was full of complications. The treaty of 1778 with the United States had bound France not to lay down her arms until the independence of the United States had been secured. On the other hand, by the treaty of 1779 with Spain, France had agreed that no peace should be concluded until Gibraltar was restored. The problem, therefore, was to secure such terms of peace from Great Britain as should satisfy both the United States and Spain, and yet leave something for France. So far as concerned the United States, independence was the only thing bargained for. The question of the boundaries and the question of the Newfoundland fisheries were matters upon which the treaty of alliance was silent, and the ministers of Louis XVI. felt themselves free to trade away these purely American interests. Spain very probably could not secure Gibraltar; but in her anxiety to close the Mississippi she might be induced to forego Gibraltar if she could be assured a liberal extension of the boundaries of Louisiana to the eastward. Great Britain must, of course, expect to lose her revolted colonies. If, however, the treaty of peace were so framed as to exclude the United States from a share in the fisheries, and were to provide for an expansion of the boundaries of Canada, England might in return be willing to grant the numerous concessions which France was anxious to obtain for herself in the East and West Indies, at Dunkirk and in Senegal.

The plan for sacrificing the United States had long been under consideration, and was now worked out in detail. The boundaries of Canada were to be extended so as to include the whole region west of the present state of Pennsylvania and north of the Ohio; while the country south of the Ohio, between the Alleghanies and the Mississippi, was to be erected into a sort of "buffer state," an independent Indian territory of which the eastern half was to be under the "protection" of the United States, and the western half under the "protection" of Spain. It was the announcement of these designs, coupled with evidence of the want of frankness—to say the

least—in the proceedings of Vergennes and his subordinates, that led the American commissioners to adopt the bold step of disregarding their instructions and of carrying through their negotiations with Great Britain without consulting the French government.

When the signature of the provisional articles was announced, and it was learned that Great Britain had agreed not only to recognize the United States, but to admit their right to share in the fisheries, and to bound their territory on the south by the Floridas, on the north by the great lakes, and on the west by the Mississippi, France accepted the result after a good deal of vigorous grumbling. But whether Spain would accept it, no one could tell. She certainly did not do so quickly or willingly. The Spanish court had never expected that Great Britain would make such extraordinary concessions, and when the news reached Madrid surprise and chagrin were everywhere apparent. The general resentment even extended to the conduct of the French government, which was thought to have acted with "precipitation" and was accused of having induced the American commissioners to treat separately in the hope of forcing Spain to peace.<sup>1</sup>

These insinuations against the good faith of France were unfounded, but it was none the less true that the signing of the provisional articles by Franklin and his colleagues did compel both Spain and France to stop the war. The news of Rodney's victory in the West Indies showed that there was no hope in that quarter. The siege of Gibraltar had been raised. France was in grave financial difficulties. Spain was helpless if left to herself. It was plain that there was nothing to do but to take the best terms that could be secured, and accordingly on January 20, 1783, the preliminary articles of peace were signed between Great Britain on the one hand and France and Spain on the other. By this treaty, France in the main reverted to the *status quo ante bellum*. Spain, on the contrary, gained greatly. The island of Minorca and the Floridas,—without troublesome definition of their boundaries,—were restored to her. Never had her colonial possessions been so great as in this last hour before her utter weakness became so strikingly apparent.

A month after the conclusion of peace, Spain consented, although still grudgingly, to recognize the independence of the United States. Even this concession was obtained only through the persistence of Lafayette, who visited Madrid in February, 1783. He found the Spanish court still full of resentment at the success of the Americans. The Spaniards feared the example in their own colonies. They would not even speak about the navigation of the Mississippi.

<sup>1</sup> *Diplomatic Corr. of the Amer. Rev.*, VI. 184.

They wished there was no such place as North America. They could see no need for haste in recognizing the United States. They would make no definite promise about the adjustment of the boundary of Florida. All that Lafayette could secure was an assurance that an American *chargé d'affaires* should be received "immediately;" but tremendous difficulties as to the etiquette of presentation at court still remained to be overcome, and it was several months after Lafayette had left Madrid before the recognition of the United States was finally and formally effected.<sup>1</sup>

During the succeeding years the question of the Mississippi was becoming increasingly important for the people of the United States. The rough and dangerous roads which led back to Virginia and Pennsylvania afforded no outlet for the products of the western settlements. Then and for half a century later, the only safe road to market was along the Mississippi; and as long as this road could not be travelled the growth of these fertile regions was effectually checked. For this reason, Jefferson regarded the possessor of New Orleans as our "natural and habitual enemy." The Spaniards at New Orleans had closed the gate to the commerce of Kentucky, and below their outposts no boat could descend the river without Spanish permission. Nevertheless, such was the force of the migratory movement, that the population of Kentucky and the Northwest Territory had grown from a few hundred in 1775 to perhaps twenty-five thousand in 1782. The census of 1790 showed a population of over 110,000. And these figures were to be multiplied nearly four fold in the next ten years.

Meanwhile, the government of the United States did not relax its efforts to get the Spanish questions settled. In 1787 Jay, who had become Secretary for Foreign Affairs, renewed in New York the negotiations which had proved so fruitless in Madrid and in Paris; but still the Spanish authorities refused even to discuss the navigation of the Mississippi. The "concluding answer" of their agent always was that the King would never yield that point, for it had always been and continued to be "one of their maxims of policy to exclude all mankind from their American shores." And it was Jay's deliberate opinion that the opening of the river to American commerce could never be secured except as the result of an aggressive war.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, Congress refused to abandon, even temporarily, what it asserted as "a clear and essential right," and the negotiation was suspended to await a happier opportunity. Nor was the opportunity long delayed; for events in Europe were destined soon to exercise a surprising influence on the final diplomatic result.

<sup>1</sup> *Diplomatic Corr. of the Amer. Rev.*, VI. 256-258, 663-667.

<sup>2</sup> *Diplomatic Corr.* 1783-1789, III. 209-215.



The death of Charles III. of Spain in December, 1788, effected a very real change in the Spanish government. For nearly thirty years he had reigned—a benevolent despot, a patron of the arts and of science, an enlightened supporter of the Roman church, and a complete master of his household as well as of his kingdom. His son, who succeeded under the name of Charles IV., had all the virtues and all the peculiarities of his father's house, but so distorted that the likeness became caricature. Like his predecessors, he found his chief amusement in shooting the game that abounded near Madrid; but the love of sport had degenerated with him into a mania that left him no leisure for other occupations. Like his father, he was an excellent husband; but his constancy and devotion not only led him to permit his wife to assume the responsibilities of the throne, but they blinded him to the notorious conduct which made her the talk of Europe. He was kind, religious and well-meaning. His reign began less than six months before the beginning of the French Revolution, and he was so unfortunate as to be utterly lacking in the clear vision and strong character which alone would have enabled him to steer a steady course in the troubled times of the next thirty years. His father—whose stronger nature had greatly impressed him—had allowed him little share in the government; and although forty years of age when he came to the throne, he was quite without views of his own and had no other thought or desire than to continue his father's policy and to lean on his father's advisers. Indeed, the dying recommendation of Charles III. had been a charge to his son to retain Florida Blanca in his service.

Florida Blanca, on his part, stood much in need of the royal support. In his long career he had created many enemies, whose hopes of overthrowing him were encouraged by the beginning of a new reign. Aranda, the ambassador in Paris, the freethinking friend of the milder revolutionists, led the opposition. He was secretly supported by the Queen, who was anxious to get power into her own hands. But Florida Blanca might long have retained his post if a more powerful rival than Aranda had not made his way into favor. Don Manuel Godoy, when Charles IV. came to the throne, was a young gentleman of the king's guards, just turned twenty-one, who, possessing neither education nor fortune, was blessed with a handsome face, good health, pleasant manners and an amiable temper. His personal charms proved a sufficient reason for dismissing the old servants of the crown and putting him at the head of the Spanish empire. Except in the Grand Duchy of Gerolstein his career is without a parallel. In a little over three

years he had become a general, a duke and prime minister of Spain ; and in three more he assumed the title of prince, after exhausting all the other honors the monarchy could bestow.

The advancement of Godoy kept pace with the march of events in France. It seems to have been at about the time of the fall of the Bastille that he first attracted the Queen's attention, and he was made prime minister less than three months after the day when the storm of insurrection swept Louis XVI. from his throne. Godoy on taking office found Spain hesitating on the brink of war. Diplomatic relations with France had been finally broken off when the French royal family had been imprisoned, but yet Spain, like England, refused to take the last step. The execution of the King put an end, however, to doubts and hesitancy, and early in 1793 war was declared both by England and by Spain.

The neighbors and avowed enemies of the United States, the possessors of Canada and Louisiana and the Floridas, were thus united in a common cause, and the times seemed unpropitious indeed, for a settlement of the vexatious and urgent foreign questions which so sorely perplexed the young nation. So far as our relations to Spain were concerned, the main topics to engage attention had been three :

*First*, and most important, the opening of the Mississippi ;

*Second*, the settlement of the Florida boundary ;

*Third*, the regulation of commerce.

To these were now to be added the irritating subject of Indian aggressions, and the claims of certain American citizens for illegal captures by Spanish privateers.

This difficult diplomatic situation was aggravated by the impatience of the western settlers and their avowed hostility towards the Spaniards, and still more by the effort of the French government to turn these sentiments to account. The trans-Alleghany region had indeed been for years a field for obscure intrigue by the minor agents of Great Britain and Spain, as well as of France. The conditions invited it. The discontent of the settlers with their political surroundings and with their dependence on the East, had led to loud and vehement threats of secession. From Detroit came hints of sympathy and help, conditioned only on a return to the allegiance of His Britannic Majesty. More substantial inducements were offered by New Orleans. Some of the principal citizens received bribes, and in 1789 the Spaniards went so far as to grant licenses to trade down the Mississippi—perhaps in the expectation that such a favor, granted and then withdrawn, would prove the strongest argument for a dependence upon the favor of Spain.

These licenses did not permit exportation of American produce from New Orleans, nor importation from abroad, and rightly enough the settlers along the Ohio were not satisfied at getting as a revocable favor only a part of what they claimed as their undoubted right. Upon the back of this great and permanent grievance of the closed Mississippi, came the widespread Indian warfare, which there was ample reason to believe was instigated by the authorities in Louisiana.

It was this condition of the public mind—irritation at the inactivity of the Federal government, irritation at the closure of the Mississippi, irritation at the irrepressible Indian outbreaks—that furnished the opportunity for Genet and his agents in the West.<sup>1</sup> The Spanish officials on their part seemed also bent on picking a quarrel, so that by the summer of 1793 Washington and his advisers were forced to the conviction that war with Spain was inevitable.

The American *chargés d'affaires* in Madrid had been instructed at the time of the Nootka Sound troubles to press for a settlement of the Mississippi question, but they had been unable to accomplish any result. They now again attempted to reopen negotiations, but they could find no disposition on the part of the Spanish Court to yield any of the points in dispute. They were told flatly that the King would never permit the United States to share the navigation of the Mississippi, and that the proposed boundary of the Floridas along latitude 31° was "extravagant and unwarrantable." Nor were events in Europe during the summer of 1793 such as to encourage hopes of increasing friendliness. In the Pyrenees, the Spanish forces had been uniformly successful. Hood at the head of the combined English and Spanish fleets had occupied Toulon. The cause of the French Republic seemed desperate, indeed, and the excesses of the Reign of Terror mere symptoms of approaching dissolution.

But as the year drew to its close, the American *chargés* were surprised to observe a different tone in the Spanish Foreign Office. Godoy himself, with characteristic good humor, took up the matter of the Indian aggressions and settled it to the satisfaction of the American government. He expressed disapproval of the conduct of the Spanish agents in America, and he declared that the question of the Florida boundary should be settled "with the utmost dispatch."<sup>2</sup>

A change so marked may well have been caused by the changed

<sup>1</sup> See "The Origin of Genet's projected Attack on Louisiana and the Floridas," *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, III. 650 (July, 1898).

<sup>2</sup> *American State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 439.

aspect of the war. In the months between September and December, 1793, the French government had displayed extraordinary energy. Carnot had organized victory, and the fruits of his efforts were becoming visible. On the very day upon which Godoy wrote his friendly assurances, Toulon was evacuated by the allies.

Almost at the same moment the Third Congress met in Philadelphia. Washington had been greatly harassed, not only by the hostile attitude of Spain and England, but by the too exuberant affection of France. It was therefore in no very amiable temper that he addressed a special message to Congress on the subject of Spanish affairs. He submitted the correspondence of the past three years, and he pointed out that the acts and declarations of the Spanish agents in America left little doubt of their desire to urge on a quarrel. His only uncertainty was whether they truly represented the views of their sovereign. Upon this point he expected shortly to be enlightened.<sup>1</sup>

Four months elapsed before news came of the more friendly attitude of the Spanish court. On April 15, 1794, the President laid before Congress, without comment, the later correspondence with Godoy; and Congress resolved that in view of the pending negotiations, no steps should be taken looking to war.<sup>2</sup> But though Congress was inclined to peace, it could not restrain the effervescent energies of the West. All that spring the Spanish *chargés* in Philadelphia were kept in a state of perpetual agitation over reports of expeditions about to be undertaken under French leadership. Now it was a force of hundreds of cavalry that was to start from Georgia for the conquest of the Floridas. Now it was a huge expedition under George Rogers Clark that was to set out in flat-boats from the falls of the Ohio, to open the Mississippi once for all. There was a foundation for all these rumors, and it is by no means impossible that if substantial French aid could have been given, and if the Federal government had been willing to wink at such enterprises, important and lasting results might have been effected; but in the absence of French naval support, and in the face of Washington's steady determination, all such attempts were bound to fail.

The news of the projected attacks on the Spanish colonies, and of the distrustful attitude of Washington's administration, reached Madrid in the summer of 1794, at a time when difficulties nearer home were becoming extremely serious. The inglorious result at Toulon had reawakened all the traditional Spanish distrust of England, and the opening of the campaign on the French frontier had

<sup>1</sup> Message of December 16, 1793.

<sup>2</sup> *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 432, 448.

proved decidedly unpropitious. The good will of the United States under these threatening circumstances, began to seem better worth cultivating, and the Spanish *chargés* in Philadelphia were instructed to call the attention of the American government to the lack of progress in the pending negotiation, and to suggest that the business might be expedited if a special envoy was sent to Madrid.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, as soon as Congress met, the President sent in the nomination of Thomas Pinckney of South Carolina—then United States minister in London—to be envoy extraordinary in Madrid. There was no delay in confirming the nomination, and full powers were made out authorizing Pinckney to treat of the navigation of the Mississippi and of all other matters in dispute between the United States and Spain. His commission was dated November 24, 1794. On that same day John Jay in London wrote to James Monroe in Paris that a treaty between the United States and His Britannic Majesty had just been signed.

Meanwhile, events on the Spanish border were not standing still. The adverse results of the first engagements of the campaign had been repeated, the Spanish forces sustaining an unbroken series of defeats. The seat of war was transferred from French to Spanish territory, and at the close of the year the Republican troops went into winter quarters holding strong positions both in Aragon and Catalonia.

In his distress Godoy again turned to the United States. Early in the autumn Monroe, the American minister at Paris, was asked to obtain permission for a Spanish agent to visit France—but he very properly declined to be drawn into what looked like an intrigue. He therefore contented himself with laying the request before the Committee of Public Safety—explaining at the same time with entire frankness the unpleasant relations existing between the United States and Spain. He also endeavored to interest the French government in the question of the Mississippi, and he received from them some vague promises that they would try to use their influence, when settling terms of peace, to secure for the United States the points in controversy. It is uncertain whether such efforts were ever really made, and at any rate the only visible result of Monroe's intervention was that Bourgoing—a former ambassador from France to Spain—was sent to the Pyrenees to begin *pourparlers* with the Spanish representatives.<sup>2</sup>

Godoy was not quite satisfied with this mere passive agency, especially when Prussia made peace with France in the spring of

<sup>1</sup> Trescot's *Diplomatic History*, pp. 238-245.

<sup>2</sup> *A View of the Conduct of the Executive*, etc., p. 137.

1795. He therefore made advances to Short—now the sole *chargé d'affaires* of the United States at Madrid—with a view to getting the American minister at Paris to treat directly with the French government. Monroe was to play the rôle at Paris which M. Cambon played in 1898 at Washington. It was Godoy's "real and sincere wish," according to Short, to conclude immediately a treaty with France; but he desired to conduct the negotiation in such a manner "that there should be no suspicion of it on the part of England, or the least possible ground of suspicion, until the conclusion and ratification of the treaty." If the French government preferred to send a confidential agent to Madrid, Godoy suggested that the agent should pass as an American. At the same time he gave Short "the fullest assurances" that all the matters in controversy should be "settled to the satisfaction of the United States."<sup>1</sup> A few days earlier the Spanish *chargé d'affaires* in Philadelphia had submitted to the Secretary of State some suggestions for a treaty, but had explained that he was without authority to do more.<sup>2</sup>

Such was the condition of affairs when, on June 28, 1795, Pinckney arrived in Madrid. He was quickly made familiar with the peculiar obstacles to the transaction of business which were created by the habits of the Spanish court. When he reached the capital the court was at Aranjuez, where Pinckney followed and where he was introduced to Godoy. Four days later the court was back in Madrid and Pinckney formally presented his credentials; but the King was there for ten days only, and "of course, everything was in a kind of hurry and confusion unfavorable to business." From Madrid the court removed to La Granja, and three months later to the Escorial; and wherever they went, the American minister was obliged to follow.

At the first interview between Pinckney and Godoy the usual suggestions of delay were made. The Spanish government, it was said, before proceeding further, wished to hear from Philadelphia what answer would be made to the terms which its representative had been instructed to propose. Pinckney replied by producing the letter from the Spanish *chargé*, in which the latter distinctly said he had no power to propose anything. Godoy's next suggestion was that there should be a triple alliance between the United States, France and Spain, and that there should be a joint negotiation between the three powers. This suggestion Pinckney refused even to discuss. He also positively refused a proposition that the United States should guarantee the Spanish possessions in America, at which refusal Godoy "appeared much mortified."

<sup>1</sup> *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 716.

<sup>2</sup> *Trescot's Diplomatic History*, pp. 245-247.



Godoy was evidently trying to gain time, and Pinckney was at some loss to understand his motives. It was Pinckney's impression that the French government had urged Spain to acknowledge the American rights, and he feared that his mission would fail unless our controversy with Spain was settled before peace was concluded with France,—an event then obviously close at hand. The growing uneasiness of the West seemed another reason for haste. He determined therefore, as he wrote to the Secretary of State, "to urge the decision as strongly as propriety and attention to my instructions will permit."

On the eighth of August, no apparent progress having yet been made, Pinckney learned to his alarm that a treaty of peace had actually been signed with France. Doubtless to his surprise and relief, this event, so far from impeding, seemed really likely to hasten the negotiation, for on the next day Godoy promised that "the business should be very speedily settled to our satisfaction,"—and said that the King had made up his mind to sacrifice something of what he considered his rights, in order to testify his good-will to the United States. These liberal assurances gave Pinckney new notions as to the motives of the Spanish government. "My present opinion," he wrote, "is that *the new position of Spain with respect to England* will induce them to come to a decision with us."

Thenceforward the negotiation began to move with reasonable promptness. About the 29th of August Pinckney presented the draft of a treaty. On the 20th of September he received a counter-project, to which he made only two serious objections. He insisted upon having a definite arrangement for a place of deposit at or near New Orleans, so that American goods might be freely shipped from river boats to sea-going vessels, and *vice versa*. And he insisted that the American claims for captures of vessels should be arbitrated. As to the right of deposit, Godoy replied that the King would only permit the landing of goods in the custom-house at New Orleans "on paying the storage dues to which his own subjects are subjected," and that this arrangement he would not "vary in the least." As to captures of vessels he was equally positive. He would never sign the treaty unless the questions were to be judged by the Spanish courts.

Finding that Godoy persisted, especially on the right of deposit, Pinckney took what seemed to him the only way of ending the negotiation. On the 24th of October he wrote that as important affairs demanded his return to England, he would on the next day take leave of their Majesties, and that he would "be charmed to execute the orders" with which the Prince of the Peace might

honor him for any place on the road. Three days later the treaty was signed.<sup>1</sup>

By its terms, Spain yielded everything the United States had asked. The Florida boundary line was fixed on the line of latitude 31°; the navigation of the Mississippi "in its whole breadth from its source to the ocean" was made free to the citizens of the United States; a right of free deposit was granted at New Orleans; a mixed commission was constituted to settle claims for captures; Indian hostilities were to be restrained; and liberal regulations were agreed upon touching the rights of neutrals, including the vital principle that "free ships make free goods."

The Spanish government had thus placed itself in the unheroic position of Donna Julia:

"A little still she strove, and much repented,  
And whispering 'I will ne'er consent'—consented."

The fundamental policy of a long line of Spanish statesmen had been abandoned; and foreign observers enquired curiously as to the motives which had prompted the making of such concessions—concessions which Talleyrand thought were certain to produce the worst effects on the political existence of Spain and on the preservation of her colonies.<sup>1</sup> Obviously enough, fear of England was the moving cause. So long as their Catholic and Britannic Majesties were in harmony, there was no hint of any favor to the United States. But just in the measure that the French forces were successful against Spain, so Spain began to be friendly toward America. And finally, when peace with France brought about the certainty of a war with England, the American claims were yielded in full. The further conclusion was inevitable, that the Spanish court must have been actuated by dread of a British attack on Louisiana by way of the Mississippi. An attack by mere filibusters from Kentucky, unsupported by a naval force at the mouth of the river, was not a very serious military menace; but a descent from Canada and Kentucky combined, backed by the power of the British navy, was a prospect not lightly to be disregarded. Such a prospect acting on the mind of a man like Godoy—a man ignorant of the long cherished policy of his predecessors and without fixed principles of his own—whose measures, as Pinckney said, were "adopted from the fluctuation of occurrences and not from system"—might well have induced compliance with anything America saw fit to ask. His mind, moreover, was greatly excited over the ending of the war with France.

<sup>1</sup> See Pinckney's correspondence in *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, I. 533-549.

<sup>2</sup> Adams's *Hist. of the U. S.*, I. 356.

He regarded it as an enormous achievement, due to his own skillful management of affairs, and he was probably in that happy state of temper where he could refuse no reasonable request civilly urged. But he was quite able to see clearly that Spain could not long continue at peace with both France and England, and he thought he could provide for the coming war by purchasing the continued neutrality of the one great neutral maritime power, and by converting the western settlements of the United States into a barrier against attack by land.

And so the varying fortunes of the wars of the French Revolution, the weakness of the King of Spain, the infatuation of the Queen, the levity and ignorance of the favorite, all worked together to open to civilization that vast region of the United States which then depended for its very existence upon the free navigation of the Mississippi.<sup>1</sup>

An interesting question remained, as to what effect, if any, Jay's treaty with England had had upon the course of Pinckney's negotiations. Pinckney himself, who had the best means of knowing, seems to have thought that the Spanish government apprehended, as a result of Jay's treaty, a joint declaration of war by the United States and Great Britain against France and Spain. In this view,

<sup>1</sup> Godoy's statements are always to be received with much caution, especially when he speaks of his own motives, but as his assertions relative to Pinckney's treaty correspond with the evidence from other sources, they may probably be relied upon. After giving some account of Florida Blanca's policy—which, he says, was to postpone any settlement with the United States while intriguing for the secession of Kentucky—Godoy continues: "C'est en cet état qu'à mon arrivée au ministère je trouvai la négociation, dans laquelle le Gouvernement américain donna beaucoup de preuves de sa franchise et de sa modération. La guerre étant presque aussitôt survenue, entre l'Espagne et la République française, un nouvel incident fit craindre pour la Louisiane une grave commotion. L'envoyé français avait l'ordre secret de révolutionner la colonie et la ramener sous les lois de ses anciens possesseurs. Il comptait sur l'appui des états limitrophes; il enrôla des soldats, souleva presque tout le Kentucky, et le Tennessee; il promit à ceux-ci la liberté du fleuve et une partie de la conquête de la Louisiane; il insulta Washington, foulant aux pieds tous les droits, toutes les convenances. La sage fermeté de cet illustre président et l'attitude sévère du Congrès déjouèrent les plans du diplomate révolutionnaire. Cet homme turbulent fut rappelé sur la demande du Gouvernement Américain. Mais les menaces et les criailleries des provinces de l'Ouest ne cessèrent pas; on persistait à demander la navigation du fleuve et la fixation des limites.

"Je sentais la justice, la force des raisonnemens allégués par les Américains. La politique, la tranquillité de la Louisiane, la sûreté de ces mers, la nécessité de se prémunir contre une attaque éventuelle de l'Angleterre à l'instant où elle ne serait plus notre alliée, la reconnaissance envers le Gouvernement des États-Unis, dont la conduite avait toujours été si loyale et si modérée, ces divers motifs me déterminèrent à faire approuver par le Roi un traité que je ménageai fort heureusement avec l'excellent citoyen Thomas Pinckney [sic]."

Godoy adds, what is certainly untrue, that it was fully agreed with Pinckney—though not expressed in the treaty—that in the event of a British attack on Louisiana, the United States would intervene in favor of Spain. See *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix*, III. 36.

Hamilton seems to have shared.<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, Monroe was of the opinion that Pinckney's success was due to the fact that he had reached Madrid at a time when we were believed to stand well with France, and when France supported our claims; and that if Pinckney had arrived a few months later, after France had seen Jay's treaty, and adopted her hostile policy to the United States in consequence of it, the mission would have failed.<sup>2</sup>

Godoy's official utterances supported Monroe. On May 6, 1797, the Spanish minister to the United States, in an angry official note, declared that he was instructed to express the astonishment of his government at discovering that engagements with England had been contracted under Jay's treaty, which were not only prejudicial to the rights of His Catholic Majesty and to the interests of his subjects, but which had been actually entered into "nearly at the same time" that the King was giving such generous proofs of his friendship by the treaty of October 27, 1795. These accusations were merely a part of the effort that Spain was then making to evade fulfilment of the latter treaty, but the pretense of surprise was ludicrously unsupported by evidence. The fact was that the text of Jay's treaty had been published in Philadelphia in July, and had reached France in August, 1795. It was therefore impossible to suppose that the Spanish Foreign Office should not have had a copy by October 27, 1795; or at least before April 25, 1796, when the ratifications of Pinckney's treaty were exchanged. And indeed the American Secretary of State, apparently on Pinckney's authority, explicitly averred that a copy of Jay's treaty was actually in Godoy's hands during the negotiations.<sup>3</sup>

Godoy unofficially, forty years later, said that Jay's treaty was what chiefly influenced his conduct. He had been vexed, he said, at the conduct of the British cabinet in secretly negotiating a treaty with the United States which gave great opportunities for ill-will, and afforded a chance of injuring Spain in her distant possessions; and he endeavored to make another treaty with these same States and had the satisfaction of succeeding.<sup>4</sup> Both of Godoy's assertions could not be true, but the discrepancy is no less inexplicable than the acts of his administration in respect to the execution of Pinckney's treaty. After deliberately agreeing to surrender all of the east bank of the Mississippi north of latitude 31°, a settled purpose was manifested—no doubt under pressure from France—to refuse to carry

<sup>1</sup> Winsor, *The Westward Movement*, p. 556.

<sup>2</sup> *A View of the Conduct of the Executive*, p. 203.

<sup>3</sup> *Amer. State Papers, For. Rel.*, II. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix*, I. 342.

out the arrangement. But then, just as Godoy was about retiring from office in consequence of French intrigues, orders were given for the surrender of the Spanish posts.

The recklessness and indifference of Godoy, and the lax organization of Spanish public offices, may perhaps furnish the key to conduct so mysterious; and it is much to be hoped that researches in the unpublished sources of Spanish history may throw some further light upon the details of a diplomatic episode which had such far-reaching consequences for the people of the United States.

G. L. RIVES.

## THE CAREER OF A KANSAS POLITICIAN

THE particular politician, with whom we are concerned, reached Lawrence, Kansas, on the twenty-second of April, 1855, alone and unannounced. He came in a primitive, rickety buggy, drawn by an old, moccasin-colored horse, which, it is to be hoped, had seen better days. The appearance of the new-comer himself was in keeping with his travelling outfit—a man quite forty years old, lank, almost haggard in figure, and dressed in overalls and a round-about. A passer-by who happened to notice him in a casual way as he alighted at the office of *The Free State* newspaper to enquire about Tecumseh, a hamlet twenty miles further west whither he intended to proceed, would have taken him for an itinerant day-laborer. That may have been the first impression in the newspaper office, but it did not last long. The easy, assured manner of the stranger, his quick penetrating glance, the fluency and originality of his talk, soon dissipated any unfavorable conclusions which his country jeans and generally disreputable appearance may have suggested. "Who are you anyway?" somebody finally asked with more bluntness than grace. "My name is Lane," was the reply, "and I hail from Indiana." One of the group happened to be a Hoosier himself and was familiar in a general way with the history of the visitor. So far from being an itinerant day-laborer, he had been a man of considerable political and military prominence—stump-orator, presidential elector, lieutenant-governor, member of the lower house of Congress and colonel of two regiments of volunteers that won distinction in the Mexican war. "My route to the territory," he said in explanation of the peculiarities of his dress, "lay through Missouri. I should have fared badly if I had been recognized. So I adopted this disguise of overalls and a round-about."

But if Lane were to settle in Kansas, why should he go to Tecumseh? That town was still in the experimental stage and might come to nothing. Lawrence, on the contrary, had an assured future. No place in the territory offered greater advantages. To go further would be to fare worse. The suggestion struck Lane favorably. After looking about the village and talking with some of the principal people he concluded to stay in Lawrence, and on the following day published a card announcing the fact.



How did it happen that Lane should betake himself to Kansas in the spring of 1855? The territory had been an unfriendly element in his career. It was his vote for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, while a member of the House of Representatives from Indiana, that ruined his political fortunes in that state. But among all the Northern politicians to whom the support of this measure brought disaster, Lane was the only one who sought to retrieve it by migrating to the debatable ground. Soon after his arrival there, the report got abroad that he had come at the instance of Senator Douglas and the administration to attempt the formation of a new, Anti-Southern Democratic party on the platform of 1852. A Kansas congressman, addressing the House of Representatives in 1866, made the definite statement that Lane, in migrating to the territory, followed "the suggestions of Mr. Douglas and other party leaders." In 1885 a little book, called *The Grim Chieftain of Kansas, by One Who Knows*, appeared which set forth with considerable detail the particulars of his alleged mission. President Pierce and Mr. Douglas, according to the confident author of this volume, foresaw that the South would be worsted in the fight for Kansas. Believing, however, that the territory might become a non-slave-holding Democratic state if matters were wisely managed, they concluded to attempt the task of converting it into a commonwealth of this sort, and solicited James Henry Lane, of Indiana, to act as their representative in the project. After some hesitation he consented to undertake the commission, stipulating by way of consideration that he should control federal patronage in the territory and have the support of the administration in any political ambitions which he might entertain.

Whatever the facts may be, two collateral points are clear: first, Lane, in his later years, when all occasion for deception, if any ever existed, had passed away, stoutly maintained that he came to Kansas as the representative of Mr. Douglas; secondly, he actually attempted to organize a new party in the name of the Illinois senator. The convention, called for this purpose, met in Lawrence on the twenty-seventh day of June. It turned out to be a small affair. Though scarcely half a score of delegates appeared they passed resolutions out of all proportion to their meagre numbers—resolutions in which the necessity for a reformed Democratic party was vigorously asserted.

Five days after the convention, and before the fate of the movement, which it was expected to begin, had become entirely evident, we find Lane at Pawnee, the temporary capital of the territory. His mission there was chiefly domestic. For some whimsical

reason he wished to obtain a divorce from his wife, whom he left behind in Indiana. During the territorial period all matters of this sort were adjudicated by the legislature.<sup>1</sup> Lane seems to have expected that his petition would be granted as a matter of course, but he was disappointed. The statesmen at Pawnee could do some extraordinary things. To make even a verbal denial of the right to hold slaves a felony punishable with imprisonment at hard labor for not less than two years was a trifle, but they could not bring themselves to release Lane from his marriage vows. They might have felt differently if he had been the *defendant* in the case—but the present reviewer does not purpose to enter upon a discussion of his domestic affairs.

Members of the legislature used to say that the rebuff which Lane experienced at Pawnee was the turning-point in his Kansas career, but the affair scarcely deserves any such prominence. It must be considered merely as an incident—unexpected, significant, possibly prophetic of evil—not as a capital event. Lane soon became convinced that all his schemes for a new party would end in smoke. Federal office-holders, secure as they supposed in their strong possession of the field, ridiculed the movement. A powerful speech, delivered by Dr. Robinson on the fourth of July, urging all anti-slavery men to stand together until Kansas should be admitted into the Union, was another discouraging event. Besides, the administration remained silent—the most untoward circumstance of all.

It soon became an urgent question with Lane—what next? Apparently he must either abandon the territory or make terms with the anti-slavery people. The return to Indiana would involve humiliations which he was not willing to face. The other horn of the dilemma, though by no means comfortable, seemed more inviting. A life-long Democrat, he had little sympathy with the theories and policies of the "Free State" party. On the contrary, he was in the habit of denouncing the radical section of it as "the offscouring and scum of Northern society." Moreover he had been saying rather freely since his arrival that in the matter of property rights "he knew no difference between a negro and a mule."

About six weeks after his fruitless attempt to establish a party of his own Lane joined the anti-slavery organization. He did not receive a cordial welcome. One man who knew something of his history made a vigorous protest. The speech evidently called for

<sup>1</sup>Some rather awkward complications attended this practice. On one occasion, at least, the presiding officer of the legislative court was co-respondent. "I've got to do the d—dest mean thing a man ever did," he said to a friend just before the court opened. "I've got to preside at the trial of Susie —." He took an extra glass of whiskey and proceeded to the discharge of his judicial duties!

a reply, but instead of an angry retort an interval of silence followed, until finally the chairman, thinking that something ought to be done, shouted, "Where is the redoubtable colonel?" Lane then came forward, and, without noticing the personal attack, proceeded to speak in a very conservative strain. "It requires wisdom," he said, "it requires manhood to restrain passion. . . . Moderation, moderation, moderation, gentlemen!"

The general policy of the anti-slavery party had been determined before Lane cut loose from Mr. Douglas and the administration. It involved the repudiation of the "bogus" territorial legislature and its laws, the organization of a state government without the usual congressional enabling act, and application for immediate admission into the Union.

If Lane was an unimportant factor in settling the plan of the campaign, he had to be reckoned with in the execution of it. By a clever ruse he succeeded in securing his own election and that of a conservative delegation from the radical town of Lawrence—the town which Dr. Robinson and the Massachusetts Emigrant Aid Company founded—to the large and important convention at Big Springs on the fifth of September, 1855. It was the first general convention of the "Free State" party. Delegates from every part of the territory, even from pro-slavery towns like Kickapoo and Le-compton, were present—all armed to the teeth. "I remember well, at the rude country hotel," said one of these delegates, "when I asked the landlady for my overcoat, her response—'Go in and get it. I would not touch that armory for all the property in the room.'"<sup>1</sup>

Perhaps the most surprising thing about this convention was that Lane, admitted to membership in the party barely three weeks before and admitted under protest, should have been selected to write the platform. And he prepared one which ought to have satisfied the most ultra "Hunker" in the territory or out of it. This curious pronunciamiento applauded the Dred Scott decision and the Fugitive Slave law, advocated the exclusion of negroes from Kansas, and repudiated, quite superfluously one would think, all sympathy with "abolitionism."

When the constitutional convention, the sequel of numerous preceding conventions, met at Topeka on the twenty-third of October, Lane was elected president of it. As he had been lieutenant-governor of Indiana for one term and consequently president of the state senate, he was not without experience in parliamentary affairs. The convention certainly needed a chairman who appreciated the anoma-

<sup>1</sup> Speer's *Life of Gen. Jas. H. Lane*, "*The Saviour of Kansas*," Garden City, Kansas, 1896. This book was written, put in type and printed by the author.

lous conditions under which it convened and the serious perils to which it was exposed, who brought to the conduct of its deliberations not only experience, but the grasp and poise of statesmanship. It embarked upon a movement which had no precedent in the history of the country and was to that extent revolutionary. Other commonwealths may have formed their constitutions without the consent of Congress, but they proceeded in subordination to the territorial authorities. The Topeka convention, so far from acting in harmony with these authorities, made no secret of its purpose to overthrow them. An assembly, meeting under such circumstances, confronted by problems grave and perplexing, conscious that the boundary between the revolutionary and the treasonable is often indistinct, must do its work in an atmosphere of excitement and tension. Upon many of the delegates the criticalness of the situation had a solemnizing effect. It intensified their sense of responsibility, lifted them above all petty and personal considerations to the sanity and disinterestedness which became the representatives of a great cause.

What did the president of the convention contribute to the deliberations of these serious days? A brief inaugural speech, occasional remarks more or less pertinent during the debates, the "black law" scheme by which negroes were to be forbidden the new state, incessant factional intrigue and—the preliminaries of a duel. One of the delegates happened to repeat certain damaging stories, which were current, in regard to Lane's private morals. The truth of the stories nobody denied, but as they were proving harmful to his political aspirations, something must be done to counteract their effect. His election as president of the convention had been a useful testimonial of confidence. What would be more likely to emphasize and re-enforce this testimonial than a challenge, especially if it should be declined? Contrary to all expectations the troublesome delegate sent a prompt acceptance. As Lane neither wished nor intended to fight, the situation was awkward and his friends had difficulty in extricating him from it. Indeed they found no easier way of escape than to withdraw the challenge and to make satisfactory apologies. The episode, sprung upon the convention for purposes wholly personal and dramatic, rudely crossed the current of its deliberations.

Apparently Lane soon forgot his personal griefs. At all events he issued a proclamation appointing the twenty-fifth of December a day of territorial thanksgiving and praise shortly after the convention adjourned. The people had suffered much, he said, from those whom they would be glad "to recognize as brothers," yet it

now seemed possible for them to secure the blessings of liberty and good government "without embruining their hands in blood."

The felicitation was premature. Lane's thanksgiving proclamation bore the date of November 27. On that very day, such was the irony of fate, the governor of the territory issued a war proclamation, ordering the military authorities, after collecting as large a force of volunteers as possible, to report for service to the sheriff of Douglas County. This doughty official had arrested an anti-slavery man in the vicinity of Lawrence on some trumped-up charge. A few friends planned and executed a successful rescue. It suited the mood of the sheriff to hold that town responsible for the affair. He thought that no better opportunity would probably offer for "wiping out the d——d abolition hole"—an enterprise dear to his heart—and he soon appeared, accompanied by ten or twelve hundred armed Missourians, to make the most of it.

Lane was the only man in the threatened town with a military record. At the battle of Buena Vista he commanded the Third Regiment of Indiana Volunteers, and, according to the official report of the brigadier-general, he and his men on that occasion "did infinite honor to the state and nation which gave them birth." After the expiration of the term of service, for which this regiment enlisted, Lane raised another, the Fifth Indiana, followed General Scott to the city of Mexico, and had the honor among other things of capturing Santa Anna's wooden leg. His military reputation grew fast up and down the border. In a surprisingly short time the opinion had become current that he must be "a powerful fighter." But in spite of his military experience and reputation the citizens of Lawrence declined to entrust him with the direction of affairs in this grave crisis, and elected a civilian, Dr. Charles Robinson, commander-in-chief. Evidently something had happened in the past six months which disturbed their confidence in the veteran of the Mexican War. The civilian, suddenly raised by vote of the town to the rank of major-general, adopted tactics of the Fabian type. He set Lane to drilling the little garrison, which comprised all the male inhabitants of Lawrence who could bear arms and volunteers from neighboring towns, and to digging rifle-pits. If attacked he would fight, not otherwise. Why should a thousand armed Missourians lay siege to Lawrence because certain persons, for whom it disavowed all responsibility, had assaulted a local sheriff? The invaders themselves soon came to be troubled by this question. If somebody should happen to attack them it would be a god-send. But the obstinate town persisted in its defensive tactics and the gallant invaders, who marched up the hill, concluded to march down again.

This famous "Wakarusa War," in which there was not a gun fired, would have had a different conclusion if our "powerful fighter" had been in command. He thrust a challenge into the proceedings of the Topeka constitutional convention for the purpose of making a sensation and of exploiting himself. In the siege of Lawrence there was another and a more serious illustration of Lane's eccentricities, to use no harsher word. At the crisis of affairs, when the tension was acutest, he made secret preparations for a night attack upon the Missourians. If this sortie had taken place it would probably have changed the whole character of Kansas history. Some one—it was the member of the constitutional convention who embarrassed Lane by accepting his challenge—reported the affair at headquarters and it was promptly suppressed.

In the festivities which followed upon the conclusion of peace—the "War" lasted scarcely two weeks—Lane appears to have forgotten his frustrated sortie. "With a desperate and wily foe already in your midst," he said in a speech of congratulation to the disbanding volunteers, "you restrained your fire determined . . . to compel them to take all the responsibility of a battle which you believed would shake the Union to its very basis."

The sheriff of Douglas County created no little disturbance, but it was quickly over and the movement toward a state government went forward as if nothing had happened. In due time the necessary machinery was provided, ready to be put in motion when it pleased Congress. Lane went to Washington in the spring of 1856 with a memorial of the "General Assembly of the State of Kansas," praying for immediate admission to the Union under the Topeka constitution. The appearance of this document in the Senate raised a storm. It was described as "a petition coming from a self-constituted, arrogant and usurping body." "I do not know," said Senator Butler of South Carolina, "that I ever felt on any occasion more sensibly an insult offered to the Senate of the United States." Unfortunately the document itself afforded ground for suspicions, since it abounded in erasures and interlineations, and the signatures were all in one hand-writing. "I do not believe," said Senator Rusk of Texas, "that this paper ever saw Kansas." Then "who is Mr. Lane, the bearer of the memorial?" it was asked. Senator Mason of Virginia called attention to the fact that no one rose to answer the inquiry and to say that Mr. Lane "is what he claims to be, an honorable man."

The memorial was withdrawn. Most men would have said that it had been damaged beyond all possibility of repair, but the bearer of it thought differently. A few days later Senator Harlan of Iowa



presented an affidavit, sworn to by Lane before a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, to the effect that the annexed "twenty-four half-sheets of paper" contained the original draft of the Kansas memorial and that he was authorized to revise it. He also explained that the members of the legislature "executed three sets of signatures," which were to be attached to revised copies of the memorial, but they had been mislaid and he ordered them to be subscribed from autographs in his possession.

Senator Harlan, in presenting the affidavit, took occasion to say that he felt humiliated because he could not rise in his seat, when the memorial was first before the Senate, and answer the sneering question, "Who is James H. Lane?" He had been looking into the history of the country, meanwhile, and proceeded to give a pretty full sketch of the apparently forgotten politician who stumped Indiana for every Democratic presidential candidate from Martin Van Buren in 1840 to Franklin Pierce in 1852. But neither original documents nor biographical sketches proved of any service. The unfortunate memorial got no better treatment on its second appearance than it received at first. Mr. Douglas surpassed even the senators from South Carolina and Texas in the violence of his denunciations. "I submit," he said, "whether here is not evidence of the most glaring fraud ever attempted to be perpetrated upon a legislative body." The bearer of the memorial replied to these charges—by a challenge. Mr. Douglas declined it.

The campaign in Washington was disastrous. It could not have succeeded in any event, but poor generalship converted what might have been an orderly retreat into a rout.

Lane's career abounds in contrasts. His pretentious affidavit, his useless "twenty-four half-sheets of paper," his ineffectual appeal to the code were succeeded by a period of extraordinary oratorical triumphs. After the failure of the memorial he visited many of the principal Northern cities to speak in behalf of Kansas. His singular ability "to talk men over" had already attracted attention in the territory, but it did not obtain any general recognition until the presidential campaign of 1856.

Lane was almost wholly a product of the border. The inspiration and the opportunity of his surroundings contented him. In this respect he was quite unlike his contemporary, and in later years, as we shall see, his great friend and patron, Abraham Lincoln, who also came up out of the wilderness. A noble discontent with the world about him drove the latter to the refuge of books. He read them in the early light of the morning and by the last embers on the hearth at night. They stimulated his thirst for knowledge, en-

larged and chastened his vocabulary, broadened and deepened his intellectual vision. Lane, on the contrary, missed everything that books can give a man. He did not care for them—had none of the finer mental aptitudes, none of the mysterious spiritual qualities which crave their ministry. His education, such as it was, came from the public street and corner grocery, from the bar-rooms of country taverns and the political convention. This education served his uses well, as his one particular talent lay in the line of public speech, and it gave him abundant opportunities for practice. He became a past master in the picturesque, bizarre dialect of the frontier and was able "to mount his stump . . . or other ready elevation," and pour forth eulogy, invective, ridicule or declamation as "any occurrent set of circumstances" might demand.

Lane's manner was always impassioned and sometimes frantic. No book of oratory can be found which would sanction his gesticulation. At the outset he might be calm enough, but the period of restraint, especially if he were dealing with a hostile audience, or with one stirred by some great passion, did not last long. Signs of passion soon began to appear, which deepened and intensified until finally coat, vest and necktie were pulled off, while his voice vibrated between shouts and blood-curdling whispers. "If his body had been made of combustible matter it would have burnt out," John Quincy Adams wrote after listening to a speech by Stephen A. Douglas. Lane's gesticulation was even more violent and fiery.

This "mouthpiece of chaos" may not have been an artist, but what of that? The final test of public speech is its immediate effectiveness. It addresses the ear, not the eye. The first, the essential life of it belongs to the hour and the audience. Whether it shall have a second life as literature, whether it will bear reproduction in type, is another matter. Very often that which thrilled the listener, bores the reader. Lane met this crucial test triumphantly. He created a great sensation wherever he went. Senator Doolittle of Wisconsin said that, though his experience in political campaigns had not been small, he never saw audiences so profoundly moved.

It was at Chicago that Lane won his greatest triumph. Ten thousand men gathered to hear him. He had a congenial theme—border ruffians, invasions, murders, a heroic constituency battling for the rights of man—and his weird, dramatic, startling oratory showed at its best. The vast multitude was roused to an enthusiasm which took the shape of volunteers and contributions as well as of tremendous applause. Newspapers of the next morning declared the meeting to be the most remarkable ever held in the state.

"We believe," said one of them, "that it will inaugurate a new era in Illinois."

Affairs were going badly at the front in the meantime—Lawrence pillaged by the persistent sheriff of Douglas county; the Topeka legislature dispersed; writs issued for the arrest of anti-slavery leaders on charges of treason, and Missouri preparing for an invasion which should settle the tedious and irritating controversy. Late in the summer Lane, his tour of speaking finished, ventured back into the territory incognito, as he happened to be included among those who had been indicted for treason and feared arrest. But his presence did not help the situation, which went steadily from bad to worse until the arrival in the early autumn of 1856 of a new governor, John W. Geary, who succeeded in bringing a temporary order out of the confusion. He sent the invading bands of armed Missourians about their business. Lane and "other meddling agitators," much to the relief of the inhabitants of Lawrence, as we are informed by an entry in the Executive Minutes, took refuge in Nebraska.

But Lane, even in exile, found little rest for the sole of his foot. He was scarcely out of the territory when he received a challenge from "two aged men . . . to name two or ten of his followers" who should arm themselves "with muskets, rifles, shot-guns or revolvers" and meet an equal number of pro-slavery men at short range on the field of honor. Evidently the bloody instructions, which Lane was accustomed to teach, returned to plague him. He did not like the terms which these "two aged men" offered and made a counter-proposition to the effect that he and Senator Atchison supported by one hundred picked men on a side should arbitrate the fate of Kansas by wager of battle in the presence of twelve United States senators and twelve members of the House of Representatives. This counter-proposition reproduced quite literally the terms of that famous old-time fight between Palamon and Arcite, though the author of it probably had never heard of those war-like youths. Neither Senator Atchison nor the "two aged men," nor anybody else saw fit to accept the revised challenge. This particular disturbance soon blew over, but it was succeeded by others, especially at Nebraska City, where a local newspaper, then published by Ex-Secretary J. Sterling Morton, made a sharp attack upon Lane. Some of his men proposed by way of retaliation to mob the office, and it was with considerable difficulty that they were prevented from carrying out their purpose. The affair caused so much excitement and bad feeling that Lane called a public "conciliatory meeting," which opened in a very boisterous and unpromising fashion.

A great many armed Missourians had taken the trouble to be present, not, however, in the interest of peace and good-will. Lane's oratory was equal to the emergency. He began by congratulating himself on the fact that so large a portion of Missouri had responded to his call for a conference. Intimate friends of his and comrades in arms had been citizens of that state. He fought in the Mexican War side by side with the gallant Colonel Doniphan, known and honored by every man before him. If he were here to-night what feasting would there be in harmony and love. Like the gentlemen from across the river he was a Democrat. With their domestic institutions he had no wish to interfere. They might keep these institutions if they were so disposed. He himself once believed in slavery. Let the gentlemen listen to the story of his awakening. It happened years ago that he went to the house of a sugar planter with a young carpenter, who wished to obtain work. After learning the object of their visit, the planter "laid himself back with his thumbs in the armholes of his vest and replied, 'I bought two carpenters yesterday.' Great God! If such men are buying carpenters, machinists, engineers, how soon will they sell you and me in their marts of human merchandise!"

When Lane concluded his speech the Missourians, who had intended to use their knives and revolvers before the meeting was over, applauded him no less enthusiastically than his own men.

The riddance, for which the citizens of Lawrence were so thankful, lasted six months. At the end of that period Lane returned to the territory. The administration of Governor Geary had just closed and that of Robert J. Walker and Frederic P. Stanton was beginning. With their advent the contest shifted somewhat. Armed invasions from Missouri were at an end, and it remained to be seen what the slave-power could accomplish by other agencies. Would it be possible to keep possession of the territorial legislature? The time for a new election approached. It was a question, much debated among the anti-slavery men, whether they should take part in it. Two conventions were called for the purpose of discussing the subject. In the first Lane opposed the policy of making a contest, in the second he favored it and found himself on the winning side. The anti-slavery party carried the election and got possession of the legislature, whose statutes and enactments they had so stubbornly repudiated.

Though the loss of this election seemed to be a crushing defeat, the pro-slavery leaders were not disposed to abandon the field. One desperate chance of retrieving their fortunes remained and they did not hesitate to embrace it. Possibly something could be done

through the agency of a constitutional convention. Such a movement had been under way some months, and culminated in what is known as the Lecompton Constitution. The pro-slavery managers declined to submit this instrument as a whole to the people, knowing very well that such a course would be fatal to it. Upon certain questions, relatively unimportant, they would allow a vote. But the constitution the people should have whether they wanted it or not, and the slaves still remaining in the territory—some four hundred in number—and their natural increase, must not be meddled with. President Buchanan sent this constitution to the Senate, accompanied by an urgent recommendation that Kansas be admitted to the Union under it, a recommendation which that body adopted.

The policy of the administration created intense excitement in Washington and elsewhere. "I have no advice to give the people of the territory of Kansas," said Senator Hamlin of Maine, "but I can say this: . . . if Congress shall, in its power, undertake to force a constitution and a state government upon that people, . . . they are only fit to be slaves, and they will be only slaves, if they do not resist it to the last extremity."

The people of Kansas scarcely needed exhortation to resist the Lecompton Constitution. Never before had they been in so dangerous a mood. Lane was in his element. It is a wonder that his incendiary stump oratory did not precipitate an actual outbreak of "Chaos and Gehenna." He went everywhere, preaching the doctrine of violence with a volcanic energy. A speech delivered at Leavenworth, November 14, 1857, furnishes an example of his style and method. "These villains," he said, referring to the members of the Lecompton Constitutional Convention, "these villains have forfeited their lives to an injured people. . . . Commence at John Calhoun, the president, and go down to Batt Jones, the hero of Oxford, and a blacker set of villains cannot be found. Truth—they know not what it means. Honesty—they don't know that it has an existence. I say that John Calhoun should have written upon his tomb-stone (if he ever die) 'Felon, Felon, Felon.' . . . I am not going to advise war or bloodshed to-night, for perhaps there is no need of that. We have got the goats so separated from the sheep that we can easily kill them without committing crime. For I truly believe that should God show his special providence here to-night, we should see in these starry heavens his hand, commanding us to kill those damned villains. . . . I say hang them, hang them to-night!"

Neither John Calhoun nor Batt Jones was hung. Other and

milder measures served every purpose. Acting-Governor Stanton called an extra session of the recently elected legislature, which promptly passed an act submitting the Lecompton Constitution to the people and they rejected it by an overwhelming majority.

The slave power now gave up the struggle for Kansas. Yet the apprehensions and alarms of Lane did not subside at once. On the contrary, when General Denver became acting governor, December 21, 1857, they received a fresh and violent lease of life. Soon after his appointment the new magistrate took occasion to denounce "those lawless and restless men who are never satisfied except when engaged in some broil." A little later Denver, not content with generalities, proceeded to post "one J. H. Lane" as a demagogue. The latter had been appointed major-general of volunteers by the legislature and had undertaken to compose certain troubles in Southern Kansas, but his presence in that section created more disturbance than it quelled. Lane replied in a furious card: "I do arraign one J. W. Denver before the country and denounce him as a calumniator, perjurer and tyrant. . . . For base political purposes he has sought an excuse for a difficulty with me, and . . . has fastened a personal quarrel upon me. As a personal quarrel it is private property, . . . I respectfully demand that there may be no interference on the part of my friends."

Lane, however, did not fail to let his friends know what he was doing. "One night about 10 o'clock, in the spring of 1858," said Captain Samuel Walker, then deputy sheriff of Douglas county, to the writer, "a messenger came in hot haste to my house—I lived in the country, three or four miles from Lawrence—and told me that I was wanted in town at once. I mounted my horse and hurried to the village. On my arrival I learned that Lane wished to see me. I found him with a number of intimate friends in his room at the Johnson House. When I entered he was writing and did not notice me. The task which appeared to absorb him so completely turned out to be the drafting of his will. When he had finished the document he read it to the company. Then, turning to me, he said, 'I have sent Denver a letter that will compel a hostile meeting. Now I do not want you as sheriff to interfere and prevent it.' 'But Denver is a dead shot,' I answered, 'and we can't spare you yet.' 'As the challenged party,' Lane replied, 'I shall have the choice of weapons. Do you see that gun in the corner? It's a Sharpe's target rifle, and another cannot be found in the territory. I shall choose it.' I saw quickly enough that there would be no fight. In the morning I rode over to Lecompton and called on Denver. He told me he had received an insulting letter from Lane, but laughed at the idea of sending him a challenge."



This melodramatic fiasco did not conclude the Denver episode. A second chapter followed which was brief but sensational. Since his old and favorite resource, the code, had failed him in dealing with the case, Lane determined to see whether better results might not be secured through the agency of a secret society. He therefore instituted one and gave it the significant name of "Danites." An atmosphere of profound mystery invested the organization. People wondered what the unknown perils, which called it into existence, could be. When the time came for definite statements there was a large attendance and it included many of the most conservative and respected citizens of Lawrence. Upon Lane as founder of the order and chief depository of its dark mysteries devolved the task of exposition. He rose with an air of tragic solemnity and said that at no period in the history of the territory had the situation been more critical than at the present moment. In the governor's chair there sits an unscrupulous and desperate man, a professed duellist, his hands reeking with human blood, a tool of the administration and in full sympathy with our enemies. Let a committee be appointed, a trustworthy, patriotic committee, who will carry through anything they may undertake without flinching. Let the committee lie in ambush for this man and rid the territory of him forever!

Lane concluded amidst the profoundest silence, which a member of the order, who could no longer repress his indignation, broke by exclaiming, "If this is a nest of d——d assassins, you may count me out." There was a general desire to be counted out and the meeting came to an abrupt conclusion.

Three days before Governor Denver warned the people of the territory against "one J. H. Lane," the President of the United States characterized him, in a message to congress, as "a most turbulent and dangerous" military leader. Lane replied to this attack in a speech delivered at Lawrence, February 13, 1858. He realized that a successful personal defence would be difficult in the presence of men who heard his address before the society of "Danites" or who were at Leavenworth when he considered the case of John Calhoun and Batt Jones, and he passed lightly over this phase of the subject. Waiving personal considerations, he devoted himself to a general review of the territorial history and spoke with a candor and fairness, with a sobriety, a directness and comprehension which surprise us. In this sanest of his Kansas speeches Lane declared that the policy of the anti-slavery *party* had been pacific. "At the great delegate convention held at Big Springs in September, 1855," he said, "it was unanimously resolved, after full discussion and deliberation, not to organize in resistance" to the

territorial government. "We adopted the *let alone* policy, neither resorting to nor resisting it. This plan was embraced as the peacefully legal one in preference to organized resistance to the territorial laws, to save the effusion of blood and to avoid those laws instead of coming in conflict with them." The people of Kansas, "patriotic, patient and peace-loving," the victim of frauds which would have driven any other community "into bloodshed and civil war," were never in arms "except to resist invasion from other states" and that after protection had been refused. A scheme of state government was devised in the interest of peace. When the Topeka movement fell into some discredit another constitution "was tendered in a Christian and patriotic spirit for a speedy and just settlement" of the controversy. Speaking of the territorial history in the Senate of the United States four years later, he made a similar statement. "In 1855, 1856, 1857 and 1858," he remarked, ". . . Kansas acted exclusively on the defensive." Though Old John Brown and the young men who wrote for the Eastern press dissented; though in the temptations and exasperations of the struggle Lane's hare-brained schemes as well as his lurid stump oratory often ran counter to this theory, yet his statement is true in regard to the tactics which the anti-slavery party adopted and on the whole successfully carried out.<sup>1</sup>

Unaccountable as it may seem, the Denver episode did not relegate Lane to private life. But what that crazy affair failed to do was very nearly effected by a common-place incident of the border, a claim dispute. Richardson, in his *Beyond the Mississippi*, relates that one day in June, 1858, as he sat in the office of the Lawrence *Herald of Freedom* writing, he heard a cry on the street—"Jim Lane has killed Gaius Jenkins." Hurrying to the scene of the affray Richardson found Jenkins dead and Lane disabled by a wound in the knee. The quarrel, which came at last to this deplorable issue, had been in progress two or three years. Jenkins accused Lane of "jumping" a claim that belonged to him. On this fatal day in June, accompanied by three armed men, he invaded the disputed premises and began to cut down an obnoxious fence. After warning him to desist, and after his own life had been threatened, Lane

<sup>1</sup> Kansas history is not very ancient, but if we may believe certain recent writers, "a curious myth," for which Governor Robinson is said to be mainly responsible, has already grown up concerning it. This myth is the "theory that there existed from the beginning two well-defined parties, the one wishing to carry its ends by war, the other by peace." Neither Governor Robinson, nor any body else, so far as the present writer is aware, holds this theory. Lane did not misrepresent the action of the Free State party. The speech and practice of a good many individuals may have been out of harmony with the resolutions at Big Springs; some of these individuals may have failed of consistency either in speech or practice—but all that is neither here nor there.

fired the deadly shot. Whatever the equities of the case may have been, technically the contention of Jenkins could not be sustained—such, at all events, was the conclusion which the Department of the Interior finally reached.

Lane won the land, but he paid a heavy price for it, far heavier than he meant to pay. The tragedy, so his friends said, "put a burden upon his soul which never lifted." Months of profound depression succeeded. One who met him on the streets of Lawrence in these dark days described him as "care-worn, haggard, reduced almost to a skeleton, the picture of despair." Politically his career seemed to be finished, so powerful was the current which the homicide set in motion against him. It is an interesting fact that Lane's return to public life, after more than a year of seclusion, should have been in a certain authentic sense by way of the church. "I baptized him August 29th, 1859," said the Rev. Mr. Dennis, "during a camp-meeting near Baldwin City. He manifested much feeling and answered all the questions readily." An element of religion, assumed or genuine, had not been wanting in his career. His piety, it is true, sometimes took on a peculiar shape. For instance, on his overland journey through Missouri *en route* to Kansas he stopped one day at a farm-house for dinner. "It is my custom," he remarked to his hostess, "to say grace before eating." After staring at him for a moment incredulously the woman replied, "Go in, then, old fellow." According to the traditions he subsequently visited Missouri disguised as the Rev. Mr. Foote, of Alabama, in order to familiarize himself with the topography of the state, thinking that possibly such information might some time be useful. He preached, it is said, on occasion, and awakened great enthusiasm by his denunciation of the Kansas abolitionists.

More than three years elapsed between Lane's application for admission to the church and his baptism at Baldwin City. The application was made during a series of revival services in the Methodist church at Lawrence—to the surprise of everybody. Near the close of one of the meetings he rose and began: "Sixteen years ago an aged, pious and widowed mother lay dying. She called her eldest son to her bedside and said, 'Henry, it is my desire that you should have religion, and that, if consistent with your feelings, you should find it within the Methodist church.' What could that son do but make the pledge? To-night he appears before you to redeem it. Wicked as he may have been, he desires to be received on probation into the church of which she was a life-long and consistent member." These words made a profound impression. "Great God!" exclaimed the leader, the Rev. Mr. Dennis, who

soon proceeded, however, from exclamations of surprise to a little good advice. "My dear brother Lane," he said, "we rejoice to hear your decision, but you will have a very narrow way to walk in. It will go out, 'Lane has joined the church.' Let men and devils know that you are earnest and honest." Whatever the devils may have thought, some men scoffed. As these periods of piety were fragmentary and often coincided with periods when "endorsements" and fresh certificates of good character would be useful, they regarded Lane's connection with the church as a move in the game of politics and nothing more. Unquestionably he had a loose and troubled possession of religion, but shall we deny to the inconstant phases of it all traces of sincerity and genuineness? Lane's own philosophy of his religious life may be as satisfactory as any. A certain speech, that he delivered at Leavenworth, fairly smoked with profanity. Some of the auditors were disgusted and took him to task. "Why," he replied in surprise, "I am a pious man. Just now, to be sure, I may not be quite up to the devotional point!" Lane's theological and ethical sentiments, it must be admitted, were unconventional. "God himself marches before us," he said, in an address on the issues of the day, before the Leavenworth Library Association, January 27, 1862, "and for my part I would just as soon follow him as any other leader!"

With the admission of Kansas to the Union in 1861 a new epoch opened for Lane. The territory interested him mainly as a convenient stepping-stone to the Senate, but the obstacles which must be overcome were very great. His blunders and follies would have ruined any ordinary man. In addition to all other burdens and disabilities he had no money. The wolf was often at his door. "I have been refused credit for a loaf of bread in Lawrence," he said on one occasion, "and my family have not even the necessities of life." When the senatorial contest opened, Lane succeeded in borrowing twenty dollars, proceeded to the capital and opened head-quarters in one of the hotels. Efforts were made to induce his landlord to turn him out of doors on the ground that he could never pay his bills, but the plot failed. If it should succeed he swore that he "would move into a dry-goods box and get ahead of the hounds." He did get ahead of them. After a campaign remarkable for its vicissitudes and uncertainties this "demon of the impossible" carried his point and reached the Senate of the United States.

"Now we shall see what a live man can do," said Lane when he left Lawrence for Washington. He set forth "to climb after his desires" with tireless energy and confidence. And these desires

soared to no ordinary pitch. The belief had long haunted him that some day the people of the country would call him to the highest office within their gift. Many were the conferences, which he held with intimate friends, on this subject. When it was once suggested that the Jenkins affair might prove troublesome he replied, "Oh that won't make any difference. General Jackson was a duellist and I don't believe that the killing of a man in self-defence will hurt me." The difficulties of organizing and conducting a national political campaign were mentioned. He thought there would be but little need of machinery. "If the young men of the territory will go into every Northern state and get up another Kansas excitement, nothing more will be necessary."

Lane reached Washington in the early days of the war. His first notable service lay outside the halls of Congress—the organization of a company of volunteers for the protection of the President. On the 18th of April, 1861, he received a request to report immediately with his men at the White House. About dusk the company followed him into the great East Room, where they bivouacked. In the middle of the night, Mr. Lincoln, arm in arm with Secretary Stanton, is said to have appeared at the door and gazed upon the spectacle with an expression of profound sadness.

Lane quickly became an important man in Washington. At one period, such were the frequency and urgency of his communications with the War Department, a carriage stood before his lodgings day and night, ready for instant use. Mr. Lincoln liked him and accepted without qualification his version of border affairs. "You can hardly conceive," General Hunter, who commanded the military department of Kansas wrote early in 1862, "to what an extent the authorities at Washington have carried their faith in the representations of Mr. Lane." The most violent domestic feuds were raging in the new state, a legacy from the territorial days, as they really began with the accession of Lane to the anti-slavery party. It soon became evident that, in the critical condition of affairs, he was not a safe leader, and that somebody must undertake to keep him within bounds, or, if that could not be done, to minimize the effect of his eccentricities and lunacies. The brunt of this disagreeable business fell upon Dr. Robinson. Sooner or later an open rupture was inevitable, and Kansas has reason to be thankful that he did not shrink from it. When Lane got the ear of the Washington authorities he won a great temporary advantage. Apparently they accepted his customary description of Robinson, who had become governor of the state—a description which lacked neither point nor emphasis—"slanderer, traitor and coward." Hence

they authorized him to raise regiments, to appoint their officers, and to usurp other functions that belonged exclusively to the governor. But partisans of Lane insisted that official red tape must not be allowed to abridge his career. They attributed to him phenomenal military genius. "He has every quality of mind and character," said *The Leavenworth Conservative*, "which belonged to the historical commanders. . . . Put Jim Lane at the head of our armies, and instead of months of idleness we shall have victories every day and a restored union in six months." Mr. Lincoln may have been less enthusiastic in his admiration, but on the 20th day of June, 1861, he wrote the Secretary of War that the services of such a man as Lane were needed in Kansas. "We had better appoint him a brigadier-general of volunteers to-day," he continued, "and take such measures as will get him into service quickest." It turned out—the matter caused a great deal of discussion in the Senate and elsewhere—that Lane never technically accepted the appointment. Yet the fact that he held no military commission did not prevent his taking the field and operating on the western border of Missouri "with a smart little army of about 1500." It was a campaign of fire and sword. This "smart little army" made a desert out of the country through which it passed, seizing property of every description, burning towns and hanging disloyalists. Lane concluded one of his dispatches with the detached, incidental observation, "I have offered a reward of \$1000 for the head of Matthews," an observation quite as suggestive and significant as the more formal part of the report. His name became a terror on the border. In 1862 a band of seventy-five negroes marched unmolested from southern Kansas to the Arkansas line and liberated some of their friends. A scout rode in advance of the main body, and if he discovered any suspicious-looking men about, it was only necessary for him to dash up to them shouting "Jim Lane, Jim Lane is coming!"—they fled in a panic.

The effect of this savage warfare upon Lane's "smart little army" was deplorable. After a few weeks of service the author of the "Miles O'Reilly" papers, then assistant adjutant-general at Fort Leavenworth, reported them as utterly demoralized—"a mere ragged, half-armed, mutinous rabble, taking votes as to whether any troublesome order should be obeyed or defied." On the 8th of October Lane undertook the defense of his marauders in a speech at Leavenworth. "Two months ago," he said, "the Kansas brigade was organized. I was put at the head of it with the respect, the confidence, aye, the love of every man in that command. . . . What is the charge which the creatures at the Fort make against



the Kansas brigade? We are Jay-hawkers. . . . When you march through a state you must destroy the property of the men in arms against it—destroy, devastate, desolate. . . . I ask you to stand between me and the vile traitors and slanderers in the rear. . . . Why, my soldiers would follow me right into the middle of hell!"

Lane was anxious for further military service and at once set about the organization of "an active winter's campaign" in western Missouri and Arkansas, of which he should be the leader. Nobody outside of Washington was consulted. General Hunter complained that "the Kansas senator would seem to have effectually 'jay-hawked' all knowledge or remembrance of him out of the minds of the authorities. The doughty old veteran, however, concluded to stand upon his rights and to lead in person any "Great Southern Expedition" that might be undertaken. His decision killed the scheme and the originator of it returned to Washington in an unhappy state of mind.

General Hunter vetoed one military enterprise upon which the Kansas senator had set his heart and General Schofield vetoed another. In August, 1863, Quantrill and his bushrangers, who destroyed Lawrence and butchered one hundred and eighty of the inhabitants, barely missed including Lane among the victims. As they escaped with little loss, he elaborated a plan of retaliation, which he believed would meet the necessities of the case. It was proposed that the entire male population of Kansas should assemble at Paola on the eighth day of October, equipped for a campaign of fifteen days; that this armed horde should be turned loose upon western Missouri to exact such satisfaction as might seem good in their sight. The commander of the department did not approve of the contemplated expedition, and gave the projectors of it to understand that he would interpose if it were attempted. A dispatch, which Lane sent Mr. Lincoln, August 26, 1863, does not leave any doubt whatever in regard to his opinion of this intermeddling commander—"the imbecility and incapacity of Schofield is most deplorable."<sup>1</sup> It turned out that General Schofield was able to deal successfully with the Paola emergency. When the eighth day of October dawned, a small fraction only of the citizens of Kansas assembled in that town, and they contented themselves with speeches and resolutions.

The next year General Sterling Price attempted a counter-invasion from Missouri. Lane joined the staff of the Federal com-

<sup>1</sup>"I have not the 'capacity' to see the wisdom or justice of permitting an irresponsible mob to enter Missouri for the purpose of retaliation." Schofield, *Forty-six Years in the Army*, p. 79.

mander and served seventeen days. It was his last appearance in the field, and his energy, his enthusiasm and knowledge of the country appear to have contributed materially to the success of the operations by which "an insolent and hopeful foe . . . was met, checked, beaten back and finally put to rout." But, when every claim which can be fairly made in Lane's behalf has been allowed, there is no escape from the conclusion that Mr. Lincoln made a serious mistake in commissioning him as brigadier-general of volunteers and dispatching him to Kansas. General Halleck thought that the appointment was putting "a premium on robbery and rascality." His view of the case came nearer the truth than Mr. Lincoln's.<sup>1</sup>

If Lane won few laurels in the field, he did gain distinction as Commissioner of Recruiting. August 4, 1862, he opened an office at Leavenworth to raise and equip negro soldiers. "I had the honor," he said in the Senate, January 4, 1864, and he repeated the statement on other occasions, "I had the honor of organizing the first regiment of colored soldiers in this war." He may not have been entirely justified in making this unqualified claim, since General Hunter, who balked his "Great Southern Expedition" so effectually, began to arm negroes in South Carolina during the month of May, 1862. Hunter's experiment did not have much immediate success. The blacks, alarmed by various sensational rumors, hesitated to enlist. A draft, which was ordered, did not help matters and the regiment finally disbanded, with the exception of a single company. That became the nucleus of a new organization, which General Saxton reported, November 12, 1862, to be "filling up rapidly—550 are already enrolled." A portion of this regiment was mustered into service November 7. Lane's colored troops experienced no vicissitudes of disbandment and reorganization. He raised them "by one swoop—just by sending out patrols the men were brought right in." The hostility of the community gave him more trouble than anything else. "On account of the prejudice of the public against the first colored regiment," he said, "I was compelled to keep it out of sight and drill it in a retired place." This regiment was not mustered into service until January 12, 1863, though, meanwhile, it "fought, drilled and labored," losing "a great many men by battle and disease."

Lane was a pro-slavery Democrat when he came to Kansas in 1855. Two years in the territory effected a great change in his

<sup>1</sup> "It was very difficult for me to comprehend the political necessity which compelled Mr. Lincoln to give his official countenance to such men as Lane and Blunt in Kansas." Schofield, *Forty-six Years in the Army*, p. III.

sentiments. "I will never cease my efforts," he said in a speech at Topeka in 1857, "until from the Yellowstone in the North to the Gulf in the South, one line of free states shall be reared, an impenetrable barrier against which the cursed waves of slavery shall dash themselves in vain. Until that time comes I am a crusader for Freedom." Soon after his arrival in Washington he began to speak of himself as "a radical and abolitionist." In 1861 he declared that if slavery shall perish thereby, "we will thank God that He has brought upon us this war." At a later period, when the subject was before Congress, he contended that colored troops ought to have all the rights and privileges of their white comrades. Let there be no discrimination, he urged, "between the soldiers . . . who mingle their blood in the same great cause."

Yet Lane advocated colonization. His most elaborate speech in Congress was devoted to a statement and defense of this policy. It seemed to him in 1861 that South America ought to be given up to the negro. "Sir, I want to see," he said in the Senate, July 18, "so soon as it can be done constitutionally these two races separated, an ocean rolling between them; that—South America—the elysium of the colored man; this the elysium of the white."

In 1864 Lane revived the scheme with some modifications. He believed that the black man could not hold his own against "the grasping cupidity" of the whites in a northern climate. We ought, therefore, he argued, to place him in a position where he can take care of himself and that will be possible only in the South. What section of it shall be dedicated to the experiment? "Some of us would be glad," he said, "to set aside South Carolina . . . as the future home of the colored man. I have frequently gone so far myself as to say that I hoped the time would come when the footprint of the white man should not be found on the soil of South Carolina." But serious objections to that locality would remain even if we should "slay all the male traitors" in it. There is, however, an available section, free from any of the difficulties which would embarrass the enterprise in South Carolina—the territory of the Rio Grande. In situation, in fertility and extent it is all that could be desired. When this territory shall be thrown open to their exclusive use, colored men will be attracted to it from Canada to the Gulf. Emigrants, crowding all the avenues of approach will hasten thither "in every kind of a vehicle from a wheel barrow to a mail-coach. . . . Thus that question which has disturbed the peace of the nation during my entire life will be fully settled."

If Mr. Lincoln conferred upon Lane powers such as no other senator either possessed or desired, the latter was able to make sub-

stantial returns for the unprecedented favors which he had received. These returns were mainly in the line of campaign oratory. As one might have anticipated, the Senate did not prove to be a favorable arena for Lane's peculiar gifts of speech. He found the atmosphere and traditions of the place a trifle oppressive. The remarkable prophecy of *The Leavenworth Conservative*—we have already quoted this mis-named periodical on Lane's military genius—came short of fulfilment. "When the Sermon on the Mount, preached by the Savior of mankind," the editor of this newspaper wrote, "ceases to be sublime, then will Lane . . . cease to be as eloquent as finite beings can be!" In the Senate his eloquence did practically cease. On one or two occasions he broke through the restraints of the place and spoke in his natural vein. "Old Jim thinks he's at Baldwin City," was the comment of a Kansan in the gallery. His latest oratorical triumphs were won, not in the Senate, but in the political campaign which preceded Mr. Lincoln's renomination. As Mr. Lincoln's first term drew to a close it became evident that a formidable opposition must be reckoned with in the Republican party. Men like Henry Winter Davis, Thaddeus Stevens and Benjamin F. Wade were out of sympathy with his policy and methods. Editors of influential newspapers, notably Mr. Greeley of *The New York Tribune*, made no secret of their disaffection. So early as the 10th of March, 1864, Lane announced that Mr. Lincoln was "the consistent, stern and proper leader" of the loyal party. He was selected, by the President himself it is said, to open the campaign in the city of New York and spoke on the thirtieth of March in Cooper Institute before the Union Lincoln Club. He began by referring to his own change of political views. "I was born and reared a Democrat," he remarked, "and Oh! what a thing to say before God—taught to believe that slavery was a divine institution." He told the story of his conversion, the story to which the Missourians listened with interest at Nebraska City in 1856. Then he passed to consider the gravity of the present crisis, urging that "the battle to be fought with ballots in November is as important as any battle to be fought with bullets during the war." He dwelt upon "the capacity for governing" which Mr. Lincoln "had amply demonstrated," and upon the fact that the selection of any other candidate would give a great shock to public confidence. The meeting concluded with three cheers for the orator and three times three for the President.

On another and more notable occasion Lane undertook a similar commission at the request of Mr. Lincoln. The Grand Council of the Union League met in Baltimore, June 6, 1864, the day before

the National Republican Convention assembled. It was understood that a demonstration would be made in the League against the President, but the rancor and violence of it surpassed all expectation. Not a word was said in reply until the storm had spent its fury. Then Lane rose and addressed himself to the task of turning "the tide of passion and excitement in the opposite direction . . . a task worthy of the highest, greatest effort of human oratory. I am no orator at all, but to precisely that task have I now set myself with absolute certainty of success. It is only needful that the true should be set forth plainly now that the false has done its worst." After a rapid survey in which the patience, the magnanimity, the statesmanship of the President were vividly and dramatically portrayed, there followed a quick glance at the great convention about to assemble. "If we nominate any other than Abraham Lincoln," said the orator, "we nominate ruin." His triumph was complete. When he finished the tide of passion and excitement had been turned in the opposite direction!

The question, who shall be the candidate for Vice-President, was also anxiously debated in Republican circles. Mr. Lincoln remained silent. It was generally thought that he favored the selection of a southern Unionist, but nobody appeared to have any definite information upon this point. Lane claimed to have secured the nomination of Andrew Johnson. "I originally selected him," he said, "as the candidate of the Republican party for the second office within the gift of that party. . . . I urged him on the convention at Baltimore." At least three months before the meeting of the convention Lane assured friends in Kansas that he would be nominated.

After the death of Mr. Lincoln, President Johnson and Congress soon parted company over the question of reconstruction. The differences came to an open rupture with the veto of the Civil Rights bill, an extreme, ill-advised measure designed to protect the negroes of the South. Senator Wade of Ohio assailed the President in the most violent language—accused him of attempting to play the part of dictator, despot and traitor; of plotting to bring back the rebels into congress "for the utter destruction of the government." In this contest Lane broke away from the radicals with whom he had fraternized and undertook the defense of the President. He denounced Wade's speech as "one of the most vindictive assaults ever made upon a public official, . . . an assault upon my personal friend . . . whom I learned to respect and admire for his pluck, his ability and integrity, and to love for his manly virtues." Wade intimated that Lane was wearing the collar of the President of the

United States, a suggestion which he indignantly repelled. "I wear a collar! The pro-slavery party of the United States backed by a Democratic administration, sustained and supported by the army, could not fasten a collar upon the handful of Kansas squatters of whom I had the honor to be the leader. . . . I wear a collar! Indicted for treason by a pro-slavery grand jury, hunted from state to state by a writ founded upon that indictment and \$100,000 offered for my head! Jim Lane wear a collar! Wherever he is known that charge will be denounced as false by both friends and enemies."

A fatal despondency succeeded this belligerent mood. Lane had been involved in some doubtful transactions connected with the management of Indian affairs. Angered by his desertion, the Republican senators proposed to investigate them. If charges were formulated and pressed, expulsion from the Senate might follow, and in that event a re-election would be impossible. The future seemed an outlook into despair. "I would give all I possess," he said, "if the mistake were undone." But had Lane made a mistake in his defense of President Johnson? Certainly not unless we measure his conduct by the standards of a blind partisanship. The scheme of reconstruction which he advocated was preferable to the rough-shod programme of the radicals. It is a curious illustration of the perversities of fate that some tardy, fitful blossoming of statesmanship should have proved an occasion of ruin to a man whose follies and sins had been so ample. But such was the case, and Lane, unable to find a better solution, cut the knot of his perplexities by suicide.

Little remains to be said in the way of epilogue to this wild biography. The personal magnetism of Lane, his enormous energy, his remarkable gifts of stump-oratory, and his impulsive patriotism, were accompanied by qualities of rashness, demagogism and moral obliquity, which made him, in spite of all that belongs to his credit, and the sum of it is not inconsiderable, a dangerous man.

LEVERETT W. SPRING.



## DOCUMENTS

### 1. *Thomas Shepard to Hugh Peter, 1645.*

FOR the following letter, written by Rev. Thomas Shepard, minister at Cambridge, Massachusetts, the readers of the REVIEW are indebted to Charles H. Firth, Esq., of the University of Oxford. The first part of it may be compared with Shepard's letter to another fellow-clergyman in England, published this same year under the title *New England's Lamentation for Old England's Errours*, His interest in the library of Harvard College is well known. Parliament had in the previous year given to Peter the library of Archbishop Laud, or, according to Peter, a small part of it (*Lords' Journals*, VIII. 582; *Last Legacy*, p. 104).

IN collecting materials for the life of Hugh Peter which I contributed to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, I met with the following letter to Peter which seems likely to interest American readers. It does not appear to have been published, at least I have not met with it in print. The original is amongst Clarendon's Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. See *Calendar of the Clarendon Manuscripts*, I. 292.

C. H. FIRTH.

My good brother Peters,

I hartily thanke you for your letter; we do greatly rejoyce to heare how greatly instrumentall God makes you; and that he keepes you spotles and blameles in your course notwithstanding the reproaches of some. I have ever thought that it was a divine hand that sent you from us for a time, and therefore till your worke be done in England I would not have you to returne to New, tho' I am one of those many who earnestly long to see you once agayne: be very watchfull for I feare nothing but some sudden stab, or some Jesuit neare you in some honest mans forme. Your child<sup>1</sup> is very well with us what ever reports may come to you to the contrary, and her education is not neglected. You seeme to thinke a letter I writ (but never thought it would have bin made publike) to be too sharpe, and that honest men who are for Christ should be suffred tho'

<sup>1</sup> Elizabeth, born 1640, the only child, to whom Peter addressed his *Last Legacy*.

they run out into opinions. I desire to shew the utmost forbearance to godly men if for a time deluded ; but otherwise I see no more reason to beare with good men in their opinions then in their morall transgressions, for they commonly are coupled together : you have had experience of the gangrene in New England, and have seene it spread in a little time, and how God hath borne witness agaynst that generation. I feare greater sorrowes attend England if they do not seasonably suppress and beare publike witness agaynst such delusions which fill the land like locusts without any king, and will certainly (if suffred) eat up the greene grasse of the land. I know there may be some connivance for a time while 'tis tumultuous and while the wars call all spirits thither, but toleration of all upon pretence of conscience I thanke God my soule abhors it : the godly in former times never fought for the liberty of there consciences by pleading for liberty for all, but they bare witness to the truth with glorious and boldnes and if they would not receive there testimony, they desired to kisse the flames and fill the prisons, and suffer to the utmost, as knowing that sufferings for the truth, were more advantagious to the promoting of it then there own peace and safety with liberty for all errour. I know the case may be such as a state may tolerate all, because of necessity they must, the numbers are so many and the hazard more ; but its one thinge to be under such a misery, another thing what is mens' duty out of such a desperate case : let me be bold (my deare brother) to perswade you to be watchfull over your selfe, least your hart herein out of love to some men growes cold to God's truth : there is but one truth (you know) and it is [*is it*] not your dayly prayer to God to blot out all errours beside from off this earth and from under these heavens, and can your spirit then close with such or beare with such evills in your ministry or judgement, which your hart in secret prayer is dayly agaynst, is it not high time for all God's ministers to awaken and purge God's floure of such chaff which lies uppermost and is growen so active and witty to deceive in these evill times : I know the honesty of the hart of brother Peters cannot beare with it, but he will take to him the zeale of his God, and do worthily herein : excuse me if I transgresse, my errour is of love ; I write nothing to grieve you my desire is the God of all grace may fill you with a spirit of might, light, and glory, and still preserve and every way enlarge you for the good of Sion.

You should do very well to helpe our Colledge with a more compleat Library, we have very good wits among us and they grow up mightily, but we want bookes ; be intreated earnestly to helpe us herein speedily, God will certainly recompence that part of your care, into your bosom : we want schoolmen especially ; helpe herein, devise some way to furnish us, we were thinking to desire the A<sup>ch</sup> Bishop's Library, and that the Parlament would recompence your labours for publike good with somewhat more usefull for your self, if you could bring about some such thing, or any other way helpe us, you could not but be remembered of us : forget us not we intreat you, and doe something in speciall for the

2 children of Dr. Ames,<sup>1</sup> who are now fatherles and motherles, William (who is now Sir Ames)<sup>2</sup> a fruit of your ministry, is one of the hope-fullest yong men that I know, and of a very gracious spirit. I beseech you send over some cloth or some such thing to them for there father's sake you know the wants of the cuntry otherwise: but I hold you too long from your worke by these lines, let me be had in your remembrance and prayers we shall never forget you. with many hearty remembrances to you I rest

Your unworthy brother

THO: SHEPARD.

Cambridge

Dec. 27, 1645.

[*Endorsed:*] To Hugh Peters,

Dec. 27, 1645.

[*Addressed:*] To the Reverend his  
deare brother M<sup>r</sup> Peters  
minister of Christ every where,  
be these

&c.

&c.

2. *The Illinois Indians to Captain Abner Prior, 1794.*

For the following letters we are indebted to Dr. N. P. Danbridge of Cincinnati. They were found in a collection of papers belonging to his grandfather, N. G. Pendleton, and great-grandfather, Jesse (or Jessie) Hunt. Hunt was a sutler and contractor with Wayne's army, and the papers probably were preserved by him. They illustrate the relations between the Illinois (or Kaskaskia) Indians and the United States agents in the interval between St. Clair's defeat (1791) and Wayne's victory (August 20, 1794). The officer to whom all three letters are addressed, Captain Abner Prior of the third sub-legion of the United States Infantry (d. 1800), is mentioned as of distinguished bravery, in Wayne's despatch of August 28, 1794 (*American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I. 491.) Jean Baptiste De Coigne or Ducoigne, the writer of the first letter, was a chief of the Kaskaskias. In the Jefferson correspondence (*Bulletin of the Bureau of Rolls and Library*, No. 6, p. 91), we find Jefferson writing to him in 1781, urging him to preserve the peace. Again in 1796 (*ibid.*) Jefferson writes him a

<sup>1</sup> Dr. William Ames, the celebrated theologian, professor at Franeker. At the time of his death, 1633, he was associated with Peter at Rotterdam. "Learned Amesius breathed his last breath into my bosom. . . . He was my colleague." Peter, *Last Report*, p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> William Ames the younger came to New England in 1637 with his mother, a brother John and an older sister Ruth. His mother died at Cambridge in December, 1644. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1645, and, returning to England, became minister at Wrentham. He was ejected in 1662 and died in 1689.

letter introducing Volney. In 1803 he was one of the signers to Harrison's treaties with the Kaskaskias, concluded at Vincennes (Bioren and Duane's *U. S. Laws*, I. 387, 408).

I. DE COIGNE TO PRIOR.

A M<sup>r</sup> Praieur Des Kaskakias ce 10 Mars 1794

Monsieur

Je vous écrit la présente pour vous informer et vous prier d'informer M<sup>r</sup> Le Commandant du Poste<sup>1</sup> que continuellement nous sommes tourmenté par les Kis et les Kikapou, qui viennent de tuer un amériquain. Les Loix ne sont point observé ici l'on ne cesse point de donner de la boisson aux sauvages de sorte que ce Pays ci est comme abandonné et exposé au plus grand Danger si lon instruit point mon Pere Le Général Washington de tous ces desordres pour qu'il envoie de la troupe pour faire observer les loix et pour repouser les ennemis. Je ne suis pas assez en force pour faire face à ces deux Nations par ce que la milice de cette Contrée n'est point en vigueur.

Les Chicachas et les Chacta viennent en Guerre contre les Illinois et contre les Pé et l'on craint que dici a un mois il sortent plus de cinq cent.

Quant aux sauvages d'en haut du Mississipy tel que les Sacs les Pakoakimina et autres nations ils sont tous amis et veulent faire une bonne paix avec les Amériquains avec moi je les attends dici a vingt jours. Les Sacs et les Pakoakimina m'ont apporté il y a un mois la Porcelaine pour faire la paix, je leur ais envoyé un Pavillon et un baril de Wisky, ils doivent venir cent hommes pour me parler.

Les Kis et les Kikapou disent au sujet de leurs freres qui sont morts de la picote que c'est moi qui les ait fait tuer et empoisonner par les Amériquains et pour se vanger il ont dit qu'il me tueroit. Depuis que je suis arrivé j'ai toujours été occupé a éloigner les ennemis mais je ne suis aidé de personne.

Je vous prie, Monsieur, de m'envoyer du secours et de me faire réponse par les personnes qui conduisent M<sup>r</sup> Flaget (?). Je fais mes sinceres complimens à M<sup>r</sup> Le Commandant et à tous les officiers et à nos bons amis les Amériquains et je je suis avec une parfaite considération, Monsieur

Votre tres humble  
et obeissant serviteur  
Prieur pour JEAN BAPTISTE  
DE COIGNE chef des  
Illinois

Le petit Prieur de  
Gallipolis assure de ses  
Civilités à son grand  
frere Praieur

(Addressed :)

A Monsieur  
Monsieur Praieur  
Capitaine  
au Poste Vincenne

<sup>1</sup> Lieutenant-Colonel J. F. Hamtramck, probably.

II. DUQUETIL (?) TO PRIOR.

Monsieur,

Je prens la liberté de vous adresser la présente, autant pour vous assurer de mes Très humbles respects, que pour vous prouver que j'ai fais mes efforts pour répondre à La confiance dont vous m'avez honoré.

J'ai présenté votre parole à la pate de dinde, qui craignant, avec raison, la jalousie de ses gens, n'a pas voulu la recevoir seul, j'ai approuvé son opinion qui m'a paru mieux tendre à la Tranquillité générale de la rivière des ilinois. Je lui ai cependant représenté, que n'étant point chef, et seulement son Traiteur, je ne pouvois prendre sur moy de former un grand conseil. mais vous ayant promis de faire ce que la prudence m'inspiroit de plus à propos, j'ai cru devoir céder à ses raisons que j'ai trouvé Bonnes.

J'ai donc consenti à ce que L'assemblée fut plus nombreuse, et conséquament à une augmentation de dépenses. quand à ce dernier objet, ou j'ai pris sur moy de passer vos ordres, je vous prie d'en agir, comme Bon vous semblera. je vous assure même, que j'ai été Bien dédommagé par le plaisir de vous être utile, et celui que j'ai goûté à leur dire amplement leurs vérités.

J'espère que vous verrez avec plaisir, leur réponse que je vous envoie. La teneur de cette réponse me surprend moi même, surtout dans une circonstance, où ils peuvent recevoir continuellement des présents considérables. J'admire qu'avec si peu de choses, que je leur ai donné, ils vous répondent si favorablement.

Enfin, Monsieur, sans prendre la liberté de vous doner des conseils, je trouve qu'en égard à la disposition présente des sauvages, et aux discours que j'entends tous les jours, il seroit à propos de leur envoyer un peu de poudre et quelques autres objets qui leur paroissent un peu importants. La circonstance me semble excellente pour les attirer.

Je vous repete que la pate de dinde m'a surpris par son zèle et sa générosité. il a doné libéralement Tout ce qu'il a reçu de vous, et l'a partagé de manière à encourager les autres à se comporter Tous en votre faveur.

Mons<sup>r</sup> Vigo<sup>1</sup> m'ayant doné ordre de recevoir aux Kaskaskias dix galons de Wiski ; je l'ai présenté a mad<sup>me</sup> Tourangeau, qui n'en avoit point dans ce temps. J'ai été contraint en conséquence de fournir moi même quarante Bouteilles de Tafia.

quelques chefs osaukis, ayants eu connoissance du conseil que j'ai tenu dans la riviere des illinois, ont conjecturé, que j'avois plus de pouvoir de votre part. ils sont venus vous offrir leur main et leur cœur, protestants qu'ils n'avoient jamais commis d'hostilité contre les grands coutteaux.

Je n'avois rien à leur répondre et je les ai renvoyé, en leur promettant

<sup>1</sup> Francis Vigo (born in Sardinia about 1740, d. 1836), formerly a great fur-trader at St. Louis, who gave valuable aid to George Rogers Clark in 1778, was now living at Vincennes, and was major commandant of the militia there (*House Report 122*, Twenty-third Congress, Second Session, pp. 15, 19; Dillon, *History of Indiana*, p. 237).

que si je recevois vos ordres à leur sujet, je les leur communiquerois à mon retour chez eux.

Je Suis, Monsieur,

Vôtre Très humble  
et Très obéissant Serviteur  
FRANC ÇOIS DUQUETIL (?)

Kahokias 10 mars

1794

(Addressed :) Au Cap<sup>tn</sup> Prayer  
député du Surintendant pour Le  
département Sauvage  
au Fort Knox<sup>1</sup>

### III. THE ILLINOIS TO PRIOR.

Réponse des chefs sauvages dans la rivière des ilinois, à la harangue que je leur ai faite.

Mon pere,

nous avons reçu Ta parole, qui nous à Tous satisfait. nous jugeons cependant, par elle, que tu crois avoir ici peu d'enfants. crois, mon pere, que Tous les mascoutins et kicapous le sont avec plaisir depuis qu'ils ont succé ton lait. ils en ont goûté peu, mais ils l'ont trouvé Bon. nous te prions, (si tu es une autre fois disposé à nous faire charité), de la proportionner à nôtre nombre.

quelques uns de nos gens, mon pere, ont été te voir. nous ne scavons ce qu'ils ont été faire, ne nous ayants pas encore parlé.

nous sommes contents que le Tailleur nous ait assemblé, pour entendre Ta parole. comme nous la trouvons Bonne et propre à exciter le Bien, nous y repondons à cœur ouvert.

Viens, mon pere, quand tu voudras, demeurer sur des terres qui sont à toi, comme à nous. nous ne pouvons, ni te les donner, ni te les vendre, ne les ayants pas faites nous mêmes. c'est le maitre de la vie, qui les à faites pour toi, comme pour nous. nous esperons donc que Tu viendras, et nous désirons de te voir, et de vivre paisiblement ensemble.

Tu nous dis que nous sommes fous, en ce que quelques uns de nos jeuns gens, étourdis, vont lever des chevelures françoises où grands cout-teaux, voler des chevaux.

cela est vrai, mon pere ; mais nous ne sommes pas fous en corps ; ce n'est que quelques jeunes gens, dequi Ta présence gagneroit les cœurs ; c'est pourquoi, nous te désirons ardemment.

nous nous flattons que Tu auras plus d'esprit que les anglois n'en ont eu dans la dernière guerre. ils nous ont levé, et tous nos morts sont encore sans couvertures. nous pensons que Tu auras plus d'esprit. prends courage, mon pere, dans ta parole.

<sup>1</sup> *I. e.*, Vincennes.



Tu nous annonce que Tu donnes la main au françois.<sup>1</sup> Tu n'ignores pas, Mon pere, que nos encêtres après L'avoir rencontré, n'ont pas souffert qu'il marche par terre ; ils l'ont porté sur des robes. tu nous assure qu'il est ton frere, et cette parole suffit pour achever de te doner entierement nos cœurs.

ne crains rien, mon pere, puisque Tu as le coeur assez fort pour pardonner ce que nos fous ton fait. tu leur fais charité ; et ils auront assez d'esprit pour se mieux comporter, et les viellards les veilleront de près.

nous désirons tous de te voir, pour te communiquer nos pensées. nous étions deux disposés a suivre le Tailleur, qui nous a répondu qu'il n'avoit pas d'ordre pour cela. Si tu as le même desiré que nous, commande lui de nous mener, nous serons toujours prêts.

Tu nous dis que Bien des mauvais oiseaux rodent sur notre rivière, de n'écouter aucune des mauvaises chansons qui se chantent, et de rester tranquilles. c'est à quoi nous travaillons, mon pere ; les chefs, les viellards et les considérés s'occupent continuellement à faire enterrer le casse-tête des jeunes gens. ainsi nous sommes déterminés a te regarder agir, jusqu'à ceque Tu nous ordonne quelque chose.

nous ne pouvons rien te dire de plus, n'ayants pas assez d'esprit. nous sçavons mieux penser que discourir.

Je ne suis pas chef, mon pere, mais c'est avec leur approbation et en leur présence que je te parle. ce sont mes chefs qui m'engagent à parler pour eux, aux quels je me joins pour te doner Tous ensemble, la main.

harangueur

LA PATE DE DINDE.

chef

COUDGIACHE.

chef

\*MICHIKITENON, frere de lagesse.<sup>2</sup>

chef

L'ÉTOURNEAU, chef du petit fort West  
du lac michigan.

\*Michikitenon est le frere de lagesse mort dans les colonies.

### 3. *South Carolina in the Presidential Election of 1800.*

When the Sixth Congress assembled for its second session, November 17, 1800, the general impression at Washington was that the result of the presidential canvass then in progress depended on the action of South Carolina, especially since the triumph of the Republicans in New York and the *impasse* in Pennsylvania. In the end, as is well known, the process of election resolved itself into two decisions. First, it was decided by the electoral votes that the next president should be one of the Republican candidates ; sec-

<sup>1</sup> If this be true, it would appear that Prior had been unduly influenced by the proclamation of George Rogers Clark, calling for volunteers for his Louisiana expedition, printed in the *Centinel of the Northwestern Territory* of January 25, 1794, and had not duly regarded St. Clair's proclamation of December 7, 1795, against the expedition. *St. Clair Papers*, II. 321.

<sup>2</sup> Lagesse was the principal chief of the Pottawatomies. A speech of his to Hamtramck, delivered in the summer of 1792, is in *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I. 241.

ondly, the House of Representatives chose Jefferson rather than Burr. It may fairly be said that the election in South Carolina was the turning-point in the first of these decisions. Its critical importance will, it is thought, lend interest to the following letters, addressed to Jefferson and Madison, and written, with one exception, by the chief leader of their party in South Carolina. The texts are derived from the originals in the Bureau of Rolls and Library in the Department of State at Washington, by the kindness of Mr. S. M. Hamilton.

Charles Pinckney (1758-1824), the writer of most of these letters, was the son of a first cousin of the brothers General Charles Cotesworth Pinckney and Major Thomas Pinckney. With the former, he had been a member of the Philadelphia Convention of 1787. He had been governor of South Carolina from 1789 to 1792 and from 1796 to 1798. Since 1798 he had been a member of the United States Senate from South Carolina. By the services which he describes in the following letters he entitled himself to the Spanish mission, which he held from 1802 to 1806. The administration ultimately lost confidence in him (*Writings of Gallatin*, I. 391).

Beside what they reveal to us of the general aspects of Carolina politics at the turn of the century (an interesting field only partially explored) and the curious personality of Charles Pinckney, these letters, especially that which is here numbered IX., cast light on the attempt to poll the votes of South Carolina for Jefferson and C. C. Pinckney. If her votes had been so cast, the former, it is now seen, would have been elected president, the latter vice-president. The managers of the Federal caucus at Philadelphia had foreseen such a possibility, or that of Pinckney's winning the first place, when they put him in nomination. Thus, Sedgwick, in a letter to King, dated Stockbridge, September 26, 1800 (*Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, III. 309), says: "At the time we agreed on Mr. Pinckney as a candidate, which was at a meeting of the whole federal party in Congress, we had every assurance which could be given by the members from S. Carolina, that whatever might be the character of their electors, such was the popularity of General Pinckney, that all the votes of that state would be given to him—if federal, of course for Adams and Pinckney, if antifederal, for Pinckney and Jefferson." Proposals looking to a vote for Pinckney and Jefferson were evidently made to the former at Columbia. Alexander Garden, in his *Eulogy on Gen. Chs. Cotesworth Pinckney*, p. 35, says, "It is a fact well understood, that . . . General C. C. Pinckney, by consenting to unite his name with that of Mr. Jefferson, would have secured to himself the unanimous vote of the Electors of South Carolina

as Vice-President ;" and he relates Pinckney's refusal. See also the letters of Gadsden to Adams and of Adams to Gadsden in Adams's *Life and Writings*, IX. 579, 584, and of Troup to King, in the latter's *Life and Correspondence*, III. 340. The Rev. Dr. C. C. Pinckney, in his *Life of General Thomas Pinckney*, pp. 155-157, fortifies the story with the authority of Justice Johnson and with that of Chancellor De Saussure, who, he says, was "a member of the committee sent by the members of the legislature to confer with General Pinckney." The statements made by Charles Pinckney (p. 127, *post*), seem to preclude the notion that the overtures to his cousin were made by the majority of the Republicans. The legislature numbered 161, with ten absentees. Upon the average, there were 85 for the Republican candidates to 66 for the Federalists. Even though 70 of the former were uncompromising in party loyalty, the other fifteen were enough to hold the balance. The committee which proposed the fusion must apparently have represented these, and certain of the Federal party, to which latter De Saussure belonged.

The biographer of Thomas Pinckney quotes De Saussure as relating that a committee, of which he was a member, twice made overtures, of the kind described, to General Pinckney. With this it happens to be possible to compare De Saussure's contemporary account of the transaction. In a letter written from Columbia on December 2, 1800, to John Rutledge in Washington, De Saussure said : "We could easily have formed a ticket, which would have been elected by a great majority, for the election of Mr. Jefferson and Gen. Pinckney. But on the most mature deliberation, we deemed it wisest and most honorable to adhere to the federal arrangements, for the equal support of Mr. Adams and Gen. Pinckney. Gen. Pinckney firmly resisted any inducement to be associated with Mr. Jefferson, at the expence of Mr. Adams." This quotation is given in the *Providence Journal* of December 24, 1800, in the course of an anonymous communication from Washington (really written by Senator Theodore Foster to Nicholas Brown).

1. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>1</sup>

October 12 : 1800

Dear Sir,

I have written you very often lately but have never yet had the pleasure of a line from you, or known whether you have received my Letters. indeed from the manner in which a Letter from Mr. Nicholas came to me after being opened, I have every reason to believe very few

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson Papers, Department of State, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 65. Endorsed by Jefferson : "Pinckney Charles, Oct. 26, 1800. recd Nov. 24."

if any of my friends Letters reach me, or those I write, the Gentlemen to whom they are Addressed. I wish to know how things will go, in Maryland and Pennsylvania and Delaware and Jersey. the influence of the officers of the Government and of the Banks and of the British and Mercantile Interest will be very powerful in Charleston. I think we shall in the City as Usual; loose  $\frac{2}{3}$ <sup>as</sup> of the representation, but the City has generally not much influence at Columbia. our Country Republican Interest has always been very strong, and I have no doubt will be so now. I have done every thing to strengthen it and mean to go to Columbia to be at the Election of Electors. the 24 numbers of *the Republican*<sup>1</sup> which I have written have been sent on to you, and I trust you have received and approved them. they are written in much moderation and have been circulated as much as possible. so has the *little Republican Farmer* I shewed you in Philadelphia and which has been reprinted in all our *Southern States*.<sup>2</sup> with these and my Speeches on Juries, Judges, Ross' Bill the Intercourse Bill and the Liberty of the Press,<sup>3</sup> we have Literally sprinkled Georgia and N<sup>o</sup> Carolina *from the Mountains to the Ocean*. Georgia will be *Unanimous*, North Carolina 8 or 9,<sup>4</sup> Tennessee Unanimous, and I am hopefull we shall also. I suppose you must have got the Volume of my Speeches. one was sent you by Post and another by Water Via Philadelphia. I have done every thing that was possible here and have been obliged *alone* to take the whole abuse of the Parties United against us. they single me out, as the object. my situation is difficult and delicate, but I push Straight on in those principles which I have always pursued, and in which I would persevere if there were but *ten Men* left who continued to think with me

October 16.— 1800

Since the within written we have had the election for Charleston, which by dint of the Bank and federal Interest, is reported by the Managers to be against us 11 to 4—that is the federalists are reported to have 11 out of 15 the number for the City representation.<sup>5</sup> many of our Members run within 28 and 30 and 40 and we think we get *four* in—I believe 5. to shew you what has been the Contest and the abuse I have been obliged to Bear, I inclose you some of the last days Publications. I suppose this unexpected opposition to *my Kinsman* who has never been opposed here before as *member for the City*, will sever and divide me from him and his Brother forever,<sup>6</sup> for the federalists all charge me with

<sup>1</sup> Doubtless contributed to a Charleston newspaper. They are mentioned by O'Neill, *Bench and Bar*, I. 141, but seem never to have been collected in a volume; but see *post*, p. 124.

<sup>2</sup> It may be conjectured that this refers to *Three Letters, Written, and Originally Published, under the Signature of a South Carolina Planter, . . . by Charles Pinckney* . . . Philadelphia, "Aurora" Office, 1799; reprinted, with some changes of title and contents, at Charleston the same year.

<sup>3</sup> *Speeches of Charles Pinckney, Esq. in Congress.* . . . Printed in 1800. Pp. 135.

<sup>4</sup> The actual number proved to be 8 for Jefferson and Burr, 4 for Adams and Pinckney.

<sup>5</sup> By the Constitution of 1790 Charleston had 15 representatives out of 124.

<sup>6</sup> C. C. Pinckney and Thomas Pinckney.

being the *sole cause* of any opposition, in this State, where all our intelligence from the Country convinces me, we shall have a *decided majority* in our Legislature. besides we mean to dispute the Election of Charleston on the ground that many have Voted who had no right and are not Citizens—I am told 200—and that a Scrutiny is to be demanded. you may be assured that I have since June labored as much as I was able,—so will I continue if my health is spared, which I trust it will, to exert myself to the Utmost, and have little doubt of succeeding. I long to hear from the Northern States. No doubt Pennsylvania will vote and do right, and Jersey—; so Gen<sup>l</sup> Mason<sup>1</sup> writes me. being lame from a recent Accident to my arm obliges me to write at intervals. I left of Yesterday and now resume my pen. since this our Accounts from the Country are still more favorable, I expect to morrow to hear further and more favorably. I never before this knew the full extent of the federal Interest connected with the British and the aid of the Banks and the federal Treasury, and all their officers. they have endeavored to Shake *Republicanism in South Carolina* to its foundations, but we have resisted it firmly and I trust successfully. our Country Interest out of the reach of Banks and Custom Houses and federal officers is I think as pure as ever. I rejoice our Legislature meets 130 or 40 Miles from the Sea. As much as I have been accustomed to Politics and to Study mankind this Election in Charleston has opened to me a new view of things. never certainly was such an Election in America. we mean to contest it for 8 or 9 of the 15. it is said several Hundred more Voted than paid taxes. *the Lame, Crippled, diseased and blind were either led, lifted or brought in Carriages to the Poll.* the sacred right of Ballot was struck at, for at a late hour, when too late to counteract it, in order to know how men, who were supposed to be under the influence of Banks and federal officers and English Merchants, Voted, and that they might be Watched to know whether they Voted as they were directed, the Novel and Unwarrantable measure was used of Voting with tickets printed on *Green and blue and red and yellow paper* and Men stationed to watch the Votes. The Contest lasted several days and Nights and will be brought before the House. in the Mean time I am charged with being the Whole and *sole cause* and so much abuse and public and private Slander, I believe no man has ever yet sustained. on *some false private Charges* I have been obliged to come forward and deny them, and whenever it may be in their power, the British and federal Interest will consider it not only *as Meritorious*, but even as *a duty* to persecute me.

I request to have a line from you saying if you receive this safe. I have kept up a correspondence in North Carolina and Georgia and sent there every thing I could. We hope from North Carolina 8 and perhaps 9 and I inclose You an Extract from Louisville<sup>2</sup> that says Georgia will be unanimous. I congratulate you most sincerely on the Change in

<sup>1</sup> Doubtless Gen. Stevens Thompson Mason, of Virginia, U. S. Senator from 1794 to 1803.

<sup>2</sup> Then the capital of Georgia.



Maryland and the probable one in North Carolina and Rhode Island. In this State I have no doubt nor ever had.

October 26: 1800—Our accounts respecting our State Legislature are every day more favorable. from those We have heard of We are sure now to have a decided majority and We still have to hear from other counties which have been always republican and which in fact we considered our strong ground. I send this under cover to M<sup>r</sup> Madison and am hopeful you will get it safe and unbroken, my Letters have many of them come to me open which obliges me to use this precaution [mutilated].

From my going to Columbia to be at the Election of Electors and other circumstances it will be late before I can go to Washington this year. besides my arm is not yet so strong as to risque too much with it in travelling and as I go by Land I must go slow, one great object I have in going by Land is to *see you at Monticello*, and my esteemed Friends M<sup>r</sup> Madison and M<sup>r</sup> Monroe. I have just got a Letter from M<sup>r</sup> Dawson<sup>1</sup> confirming from the authority of M<sup>r</sup> Burr the — business of Rhode Island.<sup>2</sup> is it possible? can good come out of Galilee?

[No signature.]

II. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO MADISON.<sup>3</sup>

Dear Sir

Permit me to put you to some little Expense and trouble in forwarding the inclosed to our friend at Monticello or wherever he may be when You get it. please send it to him under cover as I wish him much to get it safe. I congratulate You on our very fair prospects at present. We shall do well here. I am hopeful you got my little republican Farmer from Philadelphia, and afterwards from hence the Volume of my Speeches in Congress and since (that is lately) "*the Republican*" in *twenty four numbers* which I have written for this Election. As you see M<sup>r</sup> Jefferson very often I refer You to him for our political intelligence from hence as I have written him circumstantially of all our movements and prospects here, and in Georgia and North Carolina. I came home in June from Congress with a dislocated right arm, and from that time to the present I have incessantly laboured to carry this Election here and to sprinkle all the southern states with pamphlets and Essays and every thing I thought would promote the common cause against what I well knew must be the Consequence if the federalists succeeded. for this purpose if nothing prevents I go to Columbia to be present at the Election of Electors and shall of course be very late at Washington this Year. I am

<sup>1</sup> Probably John Dawson, M. C. from Virginia 1797-1814.

<sup>2</sup> All four of the Rhode Island electors voted for John Adams, but only three voted for Pinckney, the fourth casting a solitary vote for John Jay. It appears that in the autumn the Republicans had hopes of such a division in the electoral college of that state as would give some votes to their candidates. For a partial explanation of the action taken in Rhode Island, see the contemporary letters in G. C. Mason's *Reminiscences of Newport*, pp. 108-115.

<sup>3</sup> Madison Papers, Department of State, Vol. XXII., p. 86.



charged with being the *sole cause* of all the Opposition in South Carolina. *my two Kinsmen* have of course divided and will be separated from me in future. But regardless of this I persevere in that Line which I believe to be right and from which I have never deviated a tittle since my opposition to the British Treaty, that foundation of all our Evils and Divisions. In consequence I have been obliged to *bear alone the whole* weight of the abuse of the British and federal parties here and so much public and private scandal and rancour I believe no man has Yet borne in the same space. I still however push on and hope by our success that they shall Have something to abuse me for. Please send me a Line to say you receive this. direct to me at CoLumbia in this state. I rejoice to learn as I have just done By Post that MaryLand is returning to her friends and her Duty, and hoping and praying that before I see you in Virginia all things will be as they ought believe me with every sentiment I ought to bear towards a friend I so much value as Yourself—one whom I have not seen so long and who I so long to see my dear sir with affectionate regard

Yours Truly  
CHARLES PINCKNEY  
October 26: 1800  
In CharLeston

My best respects to your Lady. You recollect we used often to talk about Matrimony and I have much curiosity to see your Lady. I have heard every thing I could wish of her, for certainly if ever a man deserved a good wife You did. Had You unfortunately got, as Doctor Johnson says, in to a state of Gennocracy (is it right spelt) or petticoat Government I know no man I should have pitied more nor none I could have more sincerely wept over. But as it is, if ever I get into your neighborhood I will go and see you with confidence. have you any little Madisons running about and giving you a feeling which I assert is not otherwise to be found in human nature? the unceasing affection from Penelope to Ulysses or the ardent one from Alcyone to Ceyx was weak and impotent when compared to the affection of a parent (I mean an enlightened and cultivated one, and of principle, not a Beast, as too many are) to a child. I wish you could see my little fellow<sup>1</sup> reading me his Lesson and trying to match some twice his Years, or my little Frances<sup>2</sup> playing at ten Years old a tune and singing to it on the Piano. if you did You would only wonder that politics or any thing else could ever induce me to be so much absent from them. But you know I always loved Politics and I find as I grow older I become more fond of them.

I have just heard that Rhode Island is to give us a Vote or two—is it possible? As I have asked M<sup>r</sup> Jefferson, speaking of Rhode Island, can good come out of Galilee? I hinted to Dexter<sup>3</sup> that his Office would

<sup>1</sup> Henry Laurens Pinckney (1794–1863), who founded the *Charleston Mercury* and edited it from 1819 to 1833; M. C. 1833–1837.

<sup>2</sup> Afterward the first wife of Robert Y. Hayne.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Dexter, Secretary of War, May 13, 1800 to February 3, 1801.

be a shortlived one, as well as some others, and the Lord of his infinite Mercy grant it.

God Bless You

I have had Your Portrait sent me for my Drawing room. It is a Most exact likeness in the face. But makes you about the Body much fatter than when I saw you. if it is so I suppose You have thriven upon Matrimony and find it a good thing

To

James Madison Esquire

[Addressed :

"To

The Honourable James Madison Junior

To be left at the Post Office

at Orange Court House

"Virginia

"By Post"

Postmarked : "Charl S C

Oct 27".]

### III. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir

I have just received your favour after an interval since its date of nearly one Month. I am to particularly regret Your not recieving my communications as I wanted some facts from you to aid me in the very delicate and arduous struggle I have in this state. finding from my intelligence that the Pennsylvania Senate intended to contend for a concurrent vote in the choice of Electors<sup>2</sup> and thus to shield themselves under a pretended affection for the rights of their branch from the popular odium I very early percieved that the choice of a President would in a great measure depend upon this States Vote. I therefore very assiduously have attended to this Object since June and now wait the Issue which is to be decided on on Tuesday next. my anxiety on this subject is very much increased by a Letter I have received from Governour Monroe<sup>3</sup> in answer to one I wrote him on the subject. he seems to think with me that our state must decide it and that Pennsylvania is very uncertain. Since M<sup>r</sup> Monroe's Letter I have seen *that Woods*<sup>4</sup> is elected President of the Senate of that state. this I think is a bad symptom. he is Ross's<sup>5</sup> Brother in law. it would if it was possible make me redouble my Exertions. I am hopeful we shall succeed and although my situation is truly delicate in being obliged to oppose my own Kinsman, (who does not now on that account speak to me) yet Urged by those principles it is my

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson's Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, Nos. 38 a, 39. Endorsed by Jefferson : "rec<sup>d</sup> Dec. 12."

<sup>2</sup> In opposition to the proposal, made by the lower branch of the assembly, that the electors should be chosen by joint ballot of the two houses.

<sup>3</sup> James Monroe, Governor of Virginia.

<sup>4</sup> John Wood, speaker of the Senate of Pennsylvania from 1800 to 1802.

<sup>5</sup> James Ross, Federalist, U. S. Senator from 1794 to 1801.

duty never to forsake and well convinced that the Election depends on this State I have taken post with some valuable friends at CoLumbia where our legislature meet and are now in Session and here I mean to remain until the thing is settled. I am told I am to be personally insulted for being here while I ought to be in Washington and that a Motion will be made expressing the opinion of one of the Branches that all their Members ought to be present at the discussion of the French Treaty. But I who know that the Presidents Election is of more consequence than any Treaty and who feel my presence here to be critically important, mean to remain and my friends with You who know the reason will readily excuse my absence. To weaken the federal Party in our Legislature which is stronger than I ever knew it an attempt is made to set aside the Charleston Election and I have suggested a new idea to the Petitioners which is to suspend the sitting members immediately from their seats. I inclose You a Petition on the subject which at their requests *I have drawn and they are* now debating it. Whether they vote or not I think we shall carry the Election and the Moment it is decided I will write You. my situation here is peculiarly delicate and singular. I am the *only member* of Congress of either side present and the federalists view me with a very jealous Eye. I long to see the Business happily and safely over and to personally pay my respects to You being with great respect and regard

Dear Sir

Yours Truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

November 22: 1800

In CoLumbia

We have elected 3 republican Members of Congress And a 4th had a narrow Squeeze.

December 2: 1800 The Election is just finished and We Have, Thanks to Heaven's Goodness, carried it. We have Had a hard and arduous struggle and I found that as there Were no hopes from Philadelphia and it depended upon our State entirely to secure Your Election and that it would be almost death to our hopes for me to quit CoLumbia I have remained until it is over and now permit me to congratulate You my dear sir on an Event, which You will find we had an arduous and doubtful struggle to carry and of which I will send You the particulars before I set out. Expect me soon in Washington, but I shall be late, important public arrangements for the republican interest detaining me here a little longer. As to my own Affairs I never think of them. to secure Your Election has employed me, Mind Body and Estate since June.

To

The honourable Thomas Jefferson

I use the same precaution not to superscribe in my own hand. I trust all this precaution will not long be necessary

Post script —

Since writing the within I have some reason to Believe that much unfounded and pretended friendly information may be transmitted to promote applications to You and to decieve. I have therefore to request that so far as respects South Carolina, You would be so good as to wait the arrival of a Body of information I am collecting for your use, and intend, if nothing prevents, to Bring with me. When I arrive I will submit it to You merely for your information on such subjects as are interesting to the Republican Interest in the State and your own Superior Judgment will afterwards always best and most safely determine what is right or ought to be done.<sup>1</sup>

[Addressed : Free To  
 “The Honourable Thomas Jefferson  
 at the Seat of Government of the United States  
 at Washington  
 In Maryland

“To go By Post”

Post-marked : “Columbia S. C.  
 Dec. 2.”]

IV. PETER FRENEAU<sup>2</sup> TO JEFFERSON.

Columbia S<sup>c</sup> Carolina Dec<sup>r</sup> 2<sup>d</sup> 1800.<sup>3</sup>

Sir

I do myself the honor of informing you that at One oClock this day the election for Electors for President and Vice President of the United States was terminated by the Legislature now sitting in this place. the result is as follows.

Republican		Federal	
John Hunter	87	William Washington	69
Paul Hamilton	87	John Ward	69
Robert Anderson	85	Thomas Roper	67
Theodore Gailliard	85	James Postell	66
Arthur Simkins	84	John Blasingame	66
Wade Hampton	82	John M <sup>r</sup> Pherson	66
Andrew Love	82	William Falconer	64
Joseph Blyth	82	Henry Dana Ward	63.

The Vote tomorrow I understand will be Thomas Jefferson 8. Aaron Burr 7. Geo Clinton 1.<sup>4</sup> you will easily discover why the one Vote is

<sup>1</sup> Allusions to Pinckney's recommendations on these subjects may be found in Adams's *Writings of Gallatin*, I. 31, 38.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Freneau (1757-1813), brother of Philip Freneau the poet, secretary of the state of South Carolina and editor of the *Charleston Gazette*.

<sup>3</sup> Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 34, No. 56. Endorsed by Jefferson: “recd Dec. 12.”

<sup>4</sup> Pickering, writing to King from Easton, December 27 (*Life and Correspondence of Rufus King*, III. 352) says, “It is said in one of the newspapers that General Pinckney has written to Mr. Jefferson, that So. Carolina gave 8 votes for him and 7 for Mr. Burr.” It is probable that Freneau's letter was the original source of this (mistaken) information,

varied. I take the liberty of giving you this information because Mr C. Pinckney is not on the spot. he is at his plantation about five Miles distant<sup>1</sup> and will not be in time for the Post of this day. I know that it is his most earnest wish to give you the earliest information of the result of all our labors.

With the most sincere respect  
I have the honor to be, Sir,  
Your Most obedient  
and Very Hum<sup>l</sup> Servant,  
PETER FRENEAU.

Thomas Jefferson Esq<sup>r</sup>.

V. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>2</sup>

Dear Sir

I wrote you yesterday a short Letter of sincere congratulation on our success in the Election and as it will be some time before I can be at Washington I wish to detail to you the reasons that will inevitably detain me. When I was two Years since a candidate for the Senate I pledged myself to the republican Interest of this State to use every Exertion in my power to make a peace with France and place You in the chair and told them that from my belief of their principles and some little knowledge of the American Character and people that I believed they only wanted to be properly informed and some Exertions to be used and *per-severed in* to do every thing that was right. In a confidence in my Industry at least and perseverance, the upper Members on this occasion gave up in my favour a rule they had always observed, which was to have one senator from the Upper and one from the lower country, and elected me.<sup>3</sup> You know what has since happened with respect to France and my Exertions on that subject and it only remained at the present time to realize our Expectations respecting your Election. I clearly foresaw that if Pennsylvania did not *vote fully*, the Fortune of America depended in a great Measure on the Vote of this state. I also saw that the nomination of General Pinckney was done with a View to divide us and particularly calculated to place me in a difficult and delicate and perhaps dangerous situation. they supposed I had some influence here and thought that family reasons or the number of otherwise good republicans who would from private and personal attachment support General Pinckney, would draw me off or at least neutralize me. You must remember I mentioned this to You in Philadelphia and the event has fully justified

which Jefferson repeated in his well-known letter of December 15 to Burr. The information, it will be seen, reached him on December 12; on December 11 Senator Gunn understood the votes of South Carolina to be for Jefferson and Burr; Gunn to Hamilton, Hamilton's *Works*, VI. 483.

<sup>1</sup> See the Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1896*, pp. 858, 859.

<sup>2</sup> Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 40. Endorsed by Jefferson: "rec<sup>d</sup> Dec. 23."

<sup>3</sup> When Pinckney was elected the other senator from South Carolina was Jacob Read, a resident of Charleston, as Pinckney originally was.

the opinion I had at that time formed. I returned in June and immediately commenced my Writings and operations for the Elections that were to take place in October throughout every part of the state. The particulars of the Charleston Election I transmitted and from the Loss of that (they have 17 members)<sup>1</sup> I found it was indispensable to redouble my Exertions. the Weight of Talent, Wealth, and personal and family influence Brought against us were so great, that after the Charleston Election was lost many of our most decided friends began to despair. the federal party acquired immense confidence and it was under these circumstances I found it indispensable to come CoLumbia myself and remain there until the Election was over. Most of our friends believe that my Exertions and influence owing to the information of federal affairs I gave them, has in a great measure contributed to the decision and firmly believing myself that they were indispensable to Your Success I did not suppose myself at Liberty to quit CoLumbia until it was over. they have insured to me the hatred and persecution of the federal party for ever and the loss of even the acquaintance or personal civility of many of my relatives, but I rejoice I have done my duty to my country and shall ever consider it as among the most fortunate Events of my Life. If as Governor Monroe writes me Pennsylvania is uncertain, and South Carolina has decided the Point, I shall doubly rejoice at the honour she has done herself and "*that she is South Carolina still.*" I am uncertain Yet when I shall, from important public reasons, be able to set out or whether by sea or land. I am at present better employed here in fixing the republican Interest in this state like a rock against which future federal storms may [beat] with less probability of success and when this is finished and the Election of a Senator over I mean to set out. In the interim Believe me with affectionate attachment and great respect

Dear Sir

Yours Truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

December 1800

In CoLumbia

For fear of accidents to my former Letter, I inclose You a Duplicate of the Charleston Petition to shew what Difficulties we had to encounter there and the List of the Votes for Electors here to shew how hard and strongly contested their election has Been at CoLumbia. General Pinckney has taken his seat in the Senate the first Day<sup>2</sup> and is now in CoLumbia I am so occupied here night and Day in public Business that I have but one Moment to write to my friends and therefore I will thank You to communicate to my worthy friends General Mason and the M<sup>r</sup> Nicholass

<sup>1</sup> Fifteen in the House and two in the Senate.

<sup>2</sup> Christopher G. Champlin, Congressman from Newport, writing from Washington on December 12, and discussing the news of the South Carolina election, which had arrived in Washington the evening before, says: "It seems two or three Federal Parishes lost their votes by double returns—that is to say: Gen. Pinckney was chosen to represent two or three different Parishes." G. C. Mason, *Reminiscences of Newport*, p. 111.



and M<sup>r</sup> Burr all such intelligence from our state as I send You or may transmit and you think I would wish them to know.

This will be delivered to you by a  
Very confidential young man  
who carries our eight Votes for  
Yourself and M<sup>r</sup> Burr and We have  
been at great pains to get so  
confidential a man to carry them.

To

The Honourable Thomas Jefferson

[Addressed :

“To

“The Honourable Thomas Jefferson  
At the seat of the Government  
of the United States

at

Washington

“Favoured by M<sup>r</sup> George Brown”]

VI. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir

I wrote you some days since by the Express which carried our Votes and informed You of the necessity there was for my remaining sometime longer here to use my Exertions and those of my friends to fix the republican interest out of the reach of any future federal attack, that the Exertion of the federalists had been so uncommonly great in the late Election, as to give serious apprehensions to our friends particularly after the loss of the Charleston Election and that all the Talents Wealth and Influence of the Country had been on both sides brought into the Legislature, that believing the fortune of America to depend on our Vote I had thrown every consideration of affinity or Name or local attachment out of View and urged the giving the republican candidates *only*, our unanimous Vote. having carried this point We proceeded and have elected Yesterday a republican Governour<sup>2</sup> and M<sup>r</sup> John Ewing Calhoun<sup>3</sup> a staunch republican as my Colleague in the Senate. there are still some points important to the republican Interest to be settled and which require my presence. I then propose to go immediately to Charleston and proceed from thence to Washington to join You in time for the French Treaty which I find has not yet arrived nor have We any certain accounts of its being Signed.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 38. Endorsed by Jefferson: “rec<sup>d</sup> Dec. 17.”

<sup>2</sup> John Drayton. On the death of Governor Edward Rutledge, January 23, 1800, Drayton, being lieutenant-governor, had taken his place. The legislature now elected him governor.

<sup>3</sup> John Ewing Calhoun, cousin of John C. Calhoun, who married his daughter. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1774, was often a member of the legislature of South Carolina, and was a U. S. senator from 1801 to 1802, in which year he died.

<sup>4</sup> It was signed September 30, 1800. Davie arrived at Norfolk with it on December 15.

You must recollect that when I saw You in Philadelphia I told You it would be late before I could see you this Session, that I considered the carrying Your Election in this State as the thing to which I ought above every other to Above every other to attend to, for that could We but carry that, all subordinate arrangements would follow of course and I well knew from General Pinckney's public and private influence the opposition would be formidable and that it would be dangerous to give him the Vote of this State even if he was upon the same ticket with You. but this both parties never thought of. both were so confident of their own strength and the junction of about a dozen cautious members who would not declare themselves for either, that they rejected at the outset, all idea of compromise, and never I believe has Disappointment been greater than to the Federalists, or Joy more sincere than to the Republicans. Our State has done itself immortal honour and will I trust be considered in future as one of those firm Pillars of American republicanism which no private affection or attachment or local interest can ever for a moment shake. as such I hope We shall have the honour of presenting her to You and I will undertake to promise her warmest support to those republican and liberal measures which We are all sure will so eminently distinguish Your administration and bless Your country. If no accident happens to my health you will see me as soon as the public good authorises me to leave this place and state. no private concerns ever detain me. embarked as I am in a great Cause I have been and am wholly devoted to it and with every sentiment of respect and affectionate attachment I am my dear sir

Yours truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

December 6 : 1800

In CoLumbia

You very much surprise me by saying you have not received my Book and Numbers. The Book therefore I send again and enclose You all the Numbers I have. the remaining ten will be sent you. at present they have all that was here been distributed among the members, and the new Edition is only finished as far as I send them now—to the 14[th] partly. I will send the rest for I wish you very much to see the 4 Numbers on the Common Law as applicable to the Courts of the United States, and to give me your opinion of my reasonings on them.

For

The Honourable Thomas Jefferson

[Addressed :

“ Free

To

“ The Honourable Thomas Jefferson  
at the Seat of the Government of the  
United States at Washington  
Maryland

“ By the Post ”

Postmarked : “ Columbia S. C.  
Dec. 6.”]

VII. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir

Having finished the public Business I went to CoLumbia on I was returning to Charleston to take shipping for Washington and at this place met with a paper which is inclosed and which has surprised me exceedingly. is it possible that the State of Pennsylvania has been deprived of her Vote by a majority of two in the senate?<sup>2</sup> Or, taking the whole number of the federal part of their senate together, by *13 men, and that*, after the public opinion had been expressed by so decided a majority in every way in which their Citizens had an opportunity of doing so? and what is to *be result*? fortunately for the United States South Carolina has by her Vote decided the Election without Pennsylvania but will the people of that state so easily acquiesce in being thus deprived of their constitutional right and of the honour of having participated in the change that is to take place? I now feel doubly pleased that I remained and went to CoLumbia to aid with my Exertions the securing the Vote of this State *entire*, for had she Voted otherwise I can scarcely concieve what may have been the consequence and you must have long before this been convinced that without the Vote of this state the Event might have been doubtful; for that of Rhode Island was a Was a thing scarcely to have been looked for, and I am afraid even now to rely implicitly on it as we have just heard that some of our intelligence from Maryland is premature and that after all You will not have more than one half their Vote. I wish you to be handsomely elected and to have so many sound Votes to spare that no little carpings or cavils at dates or Words or trifles shall vitiate the Election or give to your opponents the most distant right to dispute it's regularity. I trust You and all my friends at Washington have received all my letters and therefore are not surprised at not seeing me with You yet. I knew my presence at CoLumbia to be of more consequence, than it could possible be elsewhere, for I was always afraid Pennsylvania would not vote. M<sup>r</sup> Monroe's Letter which I inclose to you strengthened this opinion and therefore I gave up the idea of going to Congress and went there. I send You M<sup>r</sup> Monroe's Letter to shew you how convinced I was and ought to have been, that Our state was to decide and as I have always made a point of attending my public duties with diligence I wish You and my friends to know the absolute necessity there was for my absence and not to blame it. I intend, if nothing prevents to be with You sometime in January and until then I remain with great Esteem and regard Dear Sir Yours Truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

I omitted to mention to You that *the Letters* I got from M<sup>r</sup> Monroe and

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 42. Endorsed by Jefferson: "recd Jan. 4."

<sup>2</sup> The Senate of Pennsylvania (Federalist) by a vote of 13 to 11 rejected a House bill providing for the election of electors by joint ballot of the two houses.

you, both shewed marks of having *been opened*

Winyaw (in South Carolina) December 20 1800  
If Colonel Hampton<sup>1</sup> of this State should go to Washington and call upon You I beg to introduce him to You in the most particular manner as one of our best friends and whose communications and services in the republican cause have been very important to us. it is with great concern I have just heard that my fears on the Rhode Island head were too well founded. I was always afraid that much good could not come out of either Nazareth or Galilee and I find I was right. New England is New England *still* and unless an earthquake could remove them and give them about ten degrees of our southern sun in their constitutions they will always remain so. You may as well attempt to separate the Barnacle from the Oyster, or a body of Caledonians as to divide New England. not so our southern Gentry. View Maryland and North Carolina and tell me by what Policy can it be, that We have lost so many Votes from states who ought to cling to the southern republican interest as to the rock of their *earthly* salvation—states too with whom so much pains have been taken to direct them in the right road.

I must request You not to come to any determination with respect to arrangements in this state until You see me, if I live to come on, as I have some information I do not choose to commit to Paper to give You after which, you will be better able to judge what is best to be done here. I have reasons very important to the republican interest for making this request, reasons which our late very arduous contest in this State could alone have developed, but which are very important to You to know.

To

The Honourable Thomas Jefferson

[Addressed :

“In Town

22 Dec’

To

The Honourable Thomas Jefferson

At the City of

FREE

Washington

in

“By Post— Maryland”]

VIII. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>2</sup>

Dear Sir

I wrote you some weeks since informing you that after the finishing some indispensable public Business important to the continuance and increase of the republican interest in this state I should go to Charleston and proceed from thence by Water either to Baltimore or to Washington as passages offered. Since this I am concerned to inform You that in

<sup>1</sup> Colonel Wade Hampton; see *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, pp. 845-850.

<sup>2</sup> Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 41. Endorsed by Jefferson: “rec<sup>d</sup> Jan. 25.”

my way down from CoLumbia stopping at this place I have been siezed with a most violent cold and sore throat occasioned by the severe cold weather we have had and my being exposed to it. it has confined me to my chamber and continues to oppress me very much. I am afraid it will be sometime before I can go on to Charleston, where I left my little ones, and to which place I have written to my friends to look out for a passage from thence to Baltimore that I may be with you as soon as possible after I am better. I wish I was with You now but my absence was inevitable, as I am sure I did more good by going up to our Legislature at CoLumbia than I could have done by going to any other Part of the Globe at that time. Whenever I see you and present to You *my situation* at CoLumbia and what passed there You will be not a little astonished. it has unravelled *mysteries* which I wish to explain to You and is the reason for my requesting You not to think of any arrangements for this State until You recieve the information I have collected and prepared for You, after which You will be fully able to judge for Yourself and know what is best to be done

the feds have had some hopes of creating confusion by there being an equality of Votes but I find by the inclosed Extract that Tennessee has made a difference of one Vote,<sup>1</sup> and as Your Majority over federal candidates is so great there can be no cavil. I am hopeful to be with You before the Votes are opened and counted and am with affectionate respect and attachment

Dear Sir

Yours Truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

January 8: 1801

At Winyaw

I am glad the French convention is ratified By Senate.<sup>2</sup> it was feared the payment for Captures might have been a clog by the disappointed federalists But I suppose the public opinion has overawed them and it passed as a matter of course. they would not venture to stop it.

IX. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>3</sup>

Dear Sir

Although not sufficiently recovered from the effects of my late fall from my carriage to venture it I propose embarking on sunday to join you at Washington having taken my passage for that purpose and as I cannot travel by land, again venture a Winter Voyage by sea. I write this Line to inform you of it and to mention that having seen in the Northern papers an account that a compromise was offered and rejected by the Federalists I do positively deny that any such compromise was

<sup>1</sup> A mistake. Tennessee gave three votes to Jefferson and three to Burr, and in the total each had 73 votes.

<sup>2</sup> It was not ratified till February 3.

<sup>3</sup> Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 41 a. Endorsed by Jefferson: "recd Feb. 8."

offered by the body of the republican interest or ever intended by them. if any thing ever was said on that subject it must have been by some one or two of our friends who might have been very anxious to secure Your Election and would rather compromise than risque it, but if even one did whisper such a thing it was *wholly unknown* to me, or to the great Body of republican interest, for they were determined from the Jump never to hear of any compromise, and so far from thinking of it they met at the academy hall in CoLumbia the very first Night of the Session and near seventy of them signed a Paper and determined not to compromise but to support the Ticket of the republican interest as it was run and carried. Ten Members from the Lower Country were absent—out of these Ten three federalists three of the republican interest and four Ties or Equalities common to both. the average Majority to be relied upon on the joint Vote was 19 and I mention this to you to shew that there is never the least Danger of the South Carolina Legislature.

The last Election was the most federal I ever knew in our state owing to Charleston and obvious reasons. the Wind having changed, certain influences will change also and under a proper Management I do not doubt Charleston may be made one of *the Strongholds* of republicanism as it possesses most excellent Materials.—Health, affectionate respect and Esteem conclude me Dear Sir

Yours Truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

January 24: 1801

In Charleston

X. CHARLES PINCKNEY TO JEFFERSON.<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir

I recollect before I left Carolina I requested you by letter not to make any arrangements or take any step respecting that State until I had seen you as I had some opinions and information to communicate on that subject.

On reflection since, I have been induced to suppose that this request on my part was an improper one, and that I ought not to presume so far as to wish to intrude on you my opinions on state arrangements, or any other subject, even as they respect South Carolina. I therefore intreat, You will *not recollect such* a request has ever been made *by me*. motives of delicacy and unfeigned respect for you make this request proper on my part before I leave Georgetown.

From the difficulty of obtaining such a conveyance either by land or water from hence as is convenient I am afraid I shall be detained some days. if in the interim M<sup>r</sup> Madison for whom I have had an unchangeable respect and friendship should arrive I will be particularly obliged to you to ask him to inform me of it that I may have an opportunity of seeing him before I go.

<sup>1</sup> Jefferson Papers, Ser. 2, Vol. 66, No. 37. Endorsed by Jefferson "recd Mar. 6."



*Journal of remarkable Occurrences in Quebec 1775* 129

If you remain here as long as I do I will do myself the honour of paying my respects to You before I set out and with my most sincere wishes for Your health and honour and success in the administration I remain with respect and regard

Dear Sir

Yours Truly

CHARLES PINCKNEY

March 5 : 1801

George Town

NOTE. "*Journal of the most remarkable Occurrences in Quebec 1775.*"

Some years ago I received from London a manuscript diary which was entitled "*Journal of the most remarkable occurrences in Quebec, since Arnold appear'd before the Town on the 14th November 1775,*" which I have only recently had an opportunity of examining. It is a foolscap octavo, 6 inches by  $3\frac{3}{4}$ , containing 95 pages and title, closely written in a uniform hand and ink, apparently at the end of the eighteenth century. The title gives no indication of authorship, but the regularity of the entries forbids the idea of its being an original. No clue exists as to its former ownership or history, further than that it was sold at a sale in London.

When looking into it, my attention was called to the diary published by the New York Historical Society in their *Collections* for 1880, p. 173, which at first glance appeared to be the same. A closer examination, however, revealed the fact that great liberties had been taken either with the manuscript or with the printed copy.

The librarian of the New York Historical Society, Mr. Kelby, kindly informed me, in response to my enquiry, that they had reprinted it from William Smith's *History of Canada, Quebec*, 1815, Vol. 2, p. 81, and a reference to that book confirmed the statement. It is a most circumstantial account of the attack by Montgomery and Arnold on Quebec, written by one of the defenders, and I was therefore surprised to find another version in existence.

The manuscript differs from the printed copy in being more concise. The lists of troops, the condition of the weather and the direction of the wind are identical, except in the first list, p. 177, *N. Y. H. S. Coll.*, where a palpable misprint, copied from Smith, destroys the correctness of the addition. Smith, as Chief Justice of Quebec, and a loyalist from New York State, with some literary reputation, must have had access to many documents which have since disappeared. He prints the diary as a footnote, without note

or comment, adding to the title "By an Officer of the Garrison." The style of the manuscript is that of a military man; that of the printed copy is more fluent, and the expanded and inverted sentences bear trace of a more practised writer. The paragraphs which have been added or altered are not those which relate to matters purely military. The prefatory matter on the first four pages of the printed copy (*N. Y. H. S. Coll.*) are represented by barely two and a half pages of manuscript, while the following extracts will give some idea of the discrepancies between the two texts :

## MS.

Dec 4. It froze hard in the night. The wind is at W today, the air clear and cold.

The habitants inform us that the rebels are lodged in St Foix parish and in the parish of Little River none of them are much above two miles from our walls. One Jeremiah Duggan formerly a hairdresser here is now stil'd Major and heads 500 Canadians.

8th . . . A horse standing at Menut's door was kill'd by a cannon ball, a few minutes after Mr Montgomery got out of the cariole.

31st Wind N. E. Snowy and cloudy. We may expect to be attacked, if what the deserter says is true. Capt. Malcolm Fraser of the Royal Emigrants in going his rounds between 4 and 5 o'clock this morning perceived signals from the enemy, he immediately alarmed the guards and picquets, who stood to their arms. All our sentrys saw flashes like lightning all around, those between St Johns Gate and Cape Diamond saw an avenue of lanterns set up on poles at regular distance. Rockets were thrown up and immediately a hot fire of musketry was kept up from behind some ridges of snow within 80 yards of the walls at Cape Diamond. The drums beat to arms, the bells rang the alarm, and in less than ten

*New York Hist. Soc. Coll. 1880.*

4th. Wind at W today. It froze hard in the night. The rebels are lodged in every house near the walls. Jeremiah Duggan, formerly a hairdresser in this place has the command of 500 Canadians, under the title of Major.

8th . . . Mr Montgomery visited Menut's today. A few minutes after he got out of the cariole a cannon ball from the walls killed his horse.

31st. About four o'clock this morning, Captain Malcolm Fraser, of Colonel Maclean's regiment, in going his rounds perceived signals not very far from St John's Gate, and finding the weather such as the enemy wished for, by the last deserter's report, he alarmed the guards and picquets who stood to their arms. All the sentries between Cape Diamond and Palace Gate saw many and repeated flashes like lightning; on the heights of Abraham lights like lanterns were placed on poles at regular distances. Two rockets were thrown up from the foot of Cape Diamond, and immediately a hot fire was kept up on those who lined the walls at that place, and a body of men were seen in St Johns suburbs and from the

minutes every person able to bear arms was in motion. Even old men upwards of 70 were forward in appearing armed for the defence of the Town. A party of the British Militia under Col Caldwell was immediately detached by Col McLean to reinforce Cape Diamond, as it was said an attack would be made there. There he posted the party and return'd to the Parade. Mr Montgomery attack'd at the same time at Près de Ville with 900 pick'd men, and Arnold attack'd at Saut au Matelot, with 700 chosen fellows, while the fire was kept up at Cape Diamond. A strong party ('tis said Canadians) appear'd in the suburb of St Johns—their bomb battery play'd on us from St Roc. Our guard at Près de Ville had perceived the flashes for some time and every man was ready at his post the gunners with lighted matches stood ready to give the rebels a warm reception; tho' the night was very dark with thick snow, yet they were seen approaching; a body of about 150 came within 50 yds of our guns, they made a stand at a narrow pass as if in consultation. Capt Barnsfare who commanded the guns watch'd the time and fir'd the instant they began to move forward, shrieks and groans were heard but nobody was seen after this cool discharge. He continued his fire nevertheless for some time.

April 9th... Mr. Chaucer has said a great deal, we suspect that he came in with no good intention—he will be taken care of.

April 17th... The Press'd Laforce to come on shore, but know-

flashes of the enemy's firing we perceived they were hid behind a bank of snow; however, we returned their fire directed by their flashes; during this sharp musketry the drums were beating to arms, the bells rang the alarm, and in less than ten minutes every man in the garrison was under arms at his alarm post; even old men upward of 70 were seen forward to oppose the rebels. Colonel MacLean detached a party of the British Militia under Colonel Caldwell to reinforce Cape Diamond; there he was to make the disposition of the men and return to the parade. Mr. Montgomery with 900 of the best men attacked at Près de Ville and Arnold with 700 chosen fellows attacked at Sault au Matelot. The attack at Cape Diamond, the Parade of men (Canadians it is said) near St John's Gate, with a bombardment from St Roc's were intended to draw off our attention from the lower town where the rebels were to make the real attacks.

Our guard at Près de Ville had seen the flashes, every man was posted before the alarm was given the gunners with lighted matches waiting the word of command. Captain Barnsfair, who commanded the battery, coolly waited the near approach of the enemy; he saw a group advancing; they stopped within 50 yards of our guns; there they seemed in consultation; at last they rushed forward to their destruction, for our grape shot mowed them down; groans and cries were heard but not a soul was seen. However, we kept sweeping the road with our guns and musketry for some time.

April 9th... Thus far Mr. Chaucer has informed us; he is suspected as a spy and will be taken care of accordingly.

April 17... They pressed Laforce to go on shore; but aware of

ing the Pointlevians too well to trust himself among them, he bid them adieu paddled on his way.

Point Levy treachery, he paddled away with a "*bon soir*."

April 18 . . . Their speaker ended with a huzza and the three hundred heartily joined him. Immediately their drums beat to arms, these men were surrounded, they were ill used and confined.

April 18 . . . Their speaker ended with a "*God save the King*," which was echoed by one and all of them with three cheers. Immediately these men were surrounded; they were very ill used and confined.

Final. The rebels stole upon us and thus they left us.

Final. The rebels stole in upon us through the woods; a dreadful panic seized them and they left us precipitately.

These extracts show that the diaries are virtually the same, and that additions and alterations have been made in the printed text. It is also quite evident that these changes must have been made by some one thoroughly familiar with the city and the story of the seige and able to add a few local incidents. Whether by the diarist himself, rewriting his diary in after years, or by Chief Justice Smith, is not now likely to be known, but the occasional ultra-loyal alterations point in the direction of the Loyalist.

JAMES BAIN, JR.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

*Method in History for Teachers and Students.* By WILLIAM H. MACE, Professor of History in Syracuse University. (Boston and London: Ginn and Co. 1897. Pp. xvii, 311.)

THIS small volume is chiefly concerned with the problem of interpreting American history to students in the secondary and primary schools. It is not a book of devices. The term "Method," says the author, "is not even intended to suggest diagrams, chronological charts, or expedients of like nature. But something far more fundamental has been the aim: the determining factors in method. . . . Whether diagrams, outlines, maps, and so on are to be used in teaching history cannot be decided by the whim of the teacher." The appeal must be made to principles. In other words Professor Mace has set himself the task of getting at the philosophy of method, so far at least as it can have a direct bearing upon the teaching of history, and of American history in particular. The book is divided into three parts: 1. The General Nature of History (pp. 1-76); 2. Organization of the Periods of American History (pp. 77-254); 3. The Elementary Phases of History Teaching (pp. 255-308).

History, according to Professor Mace, is a study of two sets of facts: a people's acts and a people's thoughts and feelings. Acts are the superficial evidence of ideas; they are the outer form of the subject-matter, while the ideas constitute the content or essence of history. As history is the study of the continuous growth or evolution of man in society through more or less marked changes in ideas, it is possible to distinguish five well-marked phases in the history of a people, a political, a religious, an educational, an industrial, and a social phase. These phases are distinguished by five organizations or "institutions:" the government, the church, the school, occupation, and the family. Speaking figuratively, Professor Mace conceives the life of a people as a "mighty stream of five currents." Thus having reduced the subject to such limits Professor Mace would value an event in history in proportion as it expresses the growth of "institutional" life. "That event or period has the highest historical value which reveals most fully the people's institutional thought and feeling" (p. 67). De Soto's expedition should be studied in a course in American history, for it had a "more intimate connection with our institutions" than the work of most Spanish explorers. One would attend to the work of George Rogers Clark or to that of Daniel Boone in proportion to its contributions to the growth of

American institutions. Inasmuch as Indian institutions did not "flow into or become a part of American institutions," Indian history may be called "non-American" history (p. 81).

Professor Mace's analysis of American history is guided by his peculiar theory of "institutions." For pedagogical purposes he casts to one side the discoveries and explorations—these belong to American history only in so far as they tended to fix the locations of "institutions." Between 1607 and 1870 he finds three periods, every one of which is marked by a dominant movement in institutional growth. Previous to 1760 the prevailing ideas of the colonists tend to the rise and growth of local institutions—the five great institutions. The New England men seek a general diffusion of rights and privileges. The Southern men on the other hand are for centralization of rights. The middle colonists are guided by no one dominant idea, but yield to the force that comes from a blending of the two somewhat distinct tendencies found in New England and in the South. From 1760 to 1789 the dominant idea is that of union: before 1783 it is union against England, and after that date it has developed distinctly into union on domestic questions. The idea of nationality which was at work before 1789 has constituted since that time a new era in institutional evolution. In analyzing the incidents and ideas of this third period (1789-1870) Professor Mace is at his best. He writes rather as a historian than as a pedagogue, and has not much occasion to force his "institutional" theory into the foreground.

If the history of institutions is to have relatively a distinct place as one phase of the study of history, then Professor Mace's theory is misleading. He has based his volume upon such terms as "institution" and "institutional ideas," terms which he has nowhere defined. To these terms he has reduced everything of consequence in American history by the application of one test. The structures of society are numerous. At the basis of civilization is the family: without it there would be no such thing as the church or the state, a system of industry or a system of education. It is thus of fundamental importance to the historian without being of first importance. Mr. Spencer has given much attention to the family. Professor McMaster, Mr. Bryce and Mr. Lecky have comparatively little to say about it. The structures with which the historian of institutions may concern himself are the systems or numerous organizations in the state which give to any country its organic unity and serve by their continuous existence to bind the past to the present. Behind these structures is the people's life, full of emotions, ideas, actions, to which no single test can ever be applied by historian, philosopher, or scientist. If there is any clear law in history it is that of incessant motion. Discrimination in the use of terms is lacking in Professor Mace's book. As a consequence his doctrine is vague and misleading. The true safe-guard for the teacher who reads the volume is his or her own interest in things simply because they were.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.



*An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects (Ancient Times).* By W. CUNNINGHAM, D.D., I.L.D., Lecturer of Trinity College, Cambridge. [Cambridge Historical Series.] (Cambridge: University Press. 1898. Pp. xii, 220.)

THIS essay is an interesting and useful attempt to "bring out the main economic features in the growth and diffusion of the civilized life in Western Europe, to which so many peoples and countries have contributed." It is an analysis of that heritage of industrial skill and commercial enterprise which the English nation now enjoys, and is diffusing over the East. Considering the immense difficulties of the task, it has been well performed. Some of these difficulties are clearly specified by the author, some not mentioned are clearly felt by him, and some, perhaps not properly realized by him, become obvious to the reader. The social and economic sides of ancient life among the peoples contributing to Western civilization were never properly described by the writers whom we must now use as sources of information, and all the wealth of monuments rendered accessible by archaeological discovery throws but an imperfect light upon the subject. Again, many modern economical and social relations did not exist at all in ancient life. They are the outcome, not of embryo devices and institutions of a more primitive society, but of inventions made outright by totally different forms of society. It is often impossible to determine where evolution set in and where invention or creation was exercised. Competition, credit, organization, labor, machinery, co-operation, combination, all mighty elements in modern economical questions, played no large rôle in ancient life. The economics of ancient life, even under imperial systems, seem therefore barren of great freely-moving forces. Absolutism on the one hand, and slavery on the other, together with the difficulties of transportation and international intercourse, and limited economical institutions, imposed upon them local characteristics. Still again, the energies of ancient life were absorbed by politics rather than by economics—the energies, that is, of the free class. It is only with the advent of free industrialism that economical relations assume a magnitude which compels typical development and evolution. Political systems and institutions enveloped and hampered economical institutions. It is, therefore, very difficult to study ancient economics apart from ancient politics, ancient commerce apart from ancient war.

The difficulties of the task being so great, it is not strange that the author's object is not fully attained. Still, it is sufficiently attained to justify the attempt. Occasionally, the narrower purpose of the book seems to merge into a larger one, that of determining the quota which each great people of the past has supplied to Western civilization in general. At such times the reader is obliged to consider what he reads a useless iteration of what has been as well said elsewhere, in the larger political histories of ancient peoples. It is easier, however, for the general historian to add his chapters of economic history to his political out-

line, than for the special historian of economics to exclude the larger political issues from his more restricted field.

Book I. gives a survey, in three chapters, of the economical conditions which prevailed in Egypt, Judaea, and Phoenicia. Egypt is a lone example of a "self-sufficing" country, developed from a simple grazing and herding land, by a vast artificial agricultural system favored by extraordinary natural advantages, into a densely peopled territory, capable of supporting its own inhabitants and all the visitors attracted to it, and of erecting for its rulers the most imperishable monuments of their wealth and power. The lack of sea-power, however, and the absence of centrifugal tendencies, made her almost wholly receptive. Her arts and learning were disseminated by her guests, and not by her own people. "Control of the food-supply was the basis of the Pharaohs' power," but that power could only conquer and exact tribute outside the Nile valley. It could not spread Egyptian civilization.

The empire of Solomon, in Palestine, formed a race which, in its dispersion, has rigidly preserved its habits and character. "They have not devoted themselves to industrial employment, nor shewn the enterprise which opens new markets or pushes fresh lines of discovery, but they have patiently pursued the humbler courses of commercial activity, as retailers and brokers." All this people ever had they took from successful neighbors. Their country was fruitful, intersected by caravan routes which made the products of other countries available through trade, and occupied by a conquered slave class which rendered manual and industrial labor unnecessary on the part of the Israelite.

The Phoenicians developed a "carrying trade between distant countries, but they were also engaged actively in importing materials and exporting manufactures for themselves." Their policy of exhausting their sources of supply, instead of enriching them, after the manner of modern English commerce, made their mission, on the whole, a cruel one. Their great industrial civilization fell, because it depended on the products of other lands for its maintenance.

Thus the salient economic traits of each of these three peoples are traced with a bold hand. The debt of Greece to Assyria and Persia might also have been distinguished. Indeed the omission of these peoples in favor of the Hebrews is a feature of the book which it is hard to justify.

Books II. and III. deal with the more familiar fields of Greek and Roman life. The Greek was eager "in the development of commerce and the race for wealth, but treated material prosperity as a means to an end—an opportunity for the maintenance of political and intellectual life." The great influence of money economy on Greek civilization is ably and strikingly developed. The permanence of the type of city organization presented by Athens is emphasized. Athens furnishes precedents in municipal, and also in national finance. Her great economic error, that of devoting public wealth to vast unproductive public works, is often forgotten in the charm exercised by her art and literature. The

city, as "a centre of noble political and active economic life," was a Greek creation. Greek experiments in organizing government over large areas were only partially successful. But they paved the way for the greater and more permanent success of the Romans. Then came the Christian Church, the era of discovery and the age of invention, with modifications of old institutions and creation of new ones. But "the main questions of household economy, of city economy and of national economy, which recur again and again, all came within the cognizance of the Greeks."

Phoenicians and Carthaginians attempted to "pursue an exclusive commerce, and to keep all rivals out of the field." Hellenic freedom of commerce triumphed against the Phoenician directly, and through Rome against the Carthaginian. The Roman extended the successful application of Hellenic economics over the world. Constantinople stored up the best attainments of Hellenic principles under Roman application, till the modern nations were ready to receive them.

B. PERRIN.

*Pausanias's Description of Greece.* Translated, with a Commentary, by J. G. FRAZER, M.A., LL.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London and New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Six vols, pp. xcvi, 616, 582, 652, 447, 638, 199.)

It is not every guide-book that appeals to the historical reviewer, nor is it every Sentimental Journey that justifies translation and commentary to the extent of six bulky volumes. But the *Periegesis* of Pausanias, in whichever quality we consider it, does both. In characterizing it as "a plain, unvarnished account by an eye-witness of the state of Greece in the second century of our era," Mr. Frazer tells but half the truth. It is all that and much more. Between the lines of the old traveller's note-book and in his wide-ranging digressions we read the whole story of the mightier Hellas which had long since passed away.

It must have been near the middle of the second century when the Lydian Greek, reared in the shadow of Mt. Sipylus and steeped in the myths and memories of his race, set his face toward the fatherland across the Aegean. Already well travelled in the East, he proposed now "to describe the whole of Greece" (or rather "all things Greek")—evidently intending to confine his view to the mainland, as he passes in silence the storied isles of the Aegean to jot down his first note at Sunium. Reaching Athens when Herodes Atticus was in the midst of his munificent activity (the Odeion was not yet built), he took up the great task which was to occupy him for many years. In the *Attica*, which appears to have been written and published before the rest, he is feeling his way and working out his method; then with a surer step he makes the round of the Peloponnese and returns to central Greece, where his further survey is confined to Boeotia and Phocis. Northern Greece is not included in the *Description* though the author had visited Thermopylae, whose hot springs he pronounces "the bluest water that he

ever saw." Thus the primal Hellas is not on his map nor is Dodona in his guide-book; he does not even cross the Euripus to describe the great Euboean cities of Chalcis and Eretria. Indeed, as Frazer remarks, "his book has neither head nor tail." He plunges into Attica without a word of introduction, and he breaks off abruptly with his account of Ozolian Locris.

But even so he has covered the ground of first importance, and what he has not done only enhances our estimate of his actual performance. Wherever Pausanias has blazed the way, we have a sure and usually sufficient guide; where he stops, we are left more or less in the dark. As Mr. Frazer well says: "Without him the ruins of Greece would for the most part be a labyrinth without a clue, a riddle without an answer. His book furnishes the clue to the labyrinth, the answer to many riddles." So the Germans have found at Olympia, the English at Megalopolis, and the Greeks at Lycosura, as the French are finding at Delphi and the Americans at Corinth; but perhaps the value of the clue can best be measured by those who have had to spade without it at Dodona and Delos and Eretria.

Thus, for all the perverse contention of certain Germans that Pausanias did not describe at first hand the Greece of his own time but slavishly copied from Polemo and other old writers descriptions of the country as it had been three hundred years before, the spade has amply vindicated his integrity and every new site explored adds further confirmation. Pausanias has been there, and his own eyes have seen what his pen describes. We do not need the recurring note of personal knowledge—as when at Amyclae he remarks "I saw the throne and I will describe it as I saw it"—to convince us of the fact. Of course, he should have acquainted himself with the works of earlier *periegetes* as we prepare for the tour of Greece by careful study of Leake and Curtius and Tozer, if we cannot carry them with us; and yet our editor shows by a detailed comparison that "the existing fragments of Polemo hardly justify us in supposing that Pausanias was acquainted" even with this the greatest of his predecessors.

As a "description of Greece," then, the work is Pausanias's own, the plain matter-of-fact record of a plodding painstaking observer who takes his bearings; measures his distances; charts every mountain, stream and town; locates every theatre and temple; and describes or at least mentions every statue and picture that is "worth seeing." To the ordinary reader all this is tiresome enough; he longs for a bit of scenery, for a breath of life, as when (and it is all too rarely) Pausanias turns from the monuments of the past to remark that: "The women of Patrae are twice as many as the men, and more charming women are nowhere to be seen. Most of them earn their livelihood by the fine flax that grows in Elis; for they weave it into nets for their hair and dresses" (vii, 21, 7); and, a little further on, "beside the river is a grove of plane-trees, most of which are hollow with age, and so big that people picnic in their hollow trunks, ay, and sleep there too if they have a mind."

But the explorer, to whom mountain and plain and river and forest still speak for themselves as the crabbed Greek of Pausanias never could have spoken for them, takes kindly to the old traveller's method and finds his dull topography and his catalogue of monuments above all price. Thanks to him, he can exactly locate the buried cities and theatres and temples; ay, and he knows where to look for the bases at least of nearly three thousand statues bearing the signature of some one hundred and fifty sculptors.

But Pausanias gives us much more than topography and monuments, much more than an eye-witness account of the Greece of his own time. For in the old Dryasdust there was a vein of sentiment and a strain of patriotism to which "all things Greek" appealed. He could not stop with his card-catalogue. Of myth and ritual, of legend and folk-lore, his pages are full; every temple has its cult, every monument its story, and all that may piously be told he tells. This is a trite observation; but few perhaps realize how much of solid history is bound up in the *Description of Greece*. Not to speak of the historical digressions (notably in the *Attica* and the *Phocis*), the continuous historical introduction takes up one-third of the *Laconia*, more than half of the *Achaia*, and four-fifths of the *Messenia*. Here, of course, Pausanias is drawing largely upon literary sources; and where these are lost (as in the case of *Messenia*) he becomes an ultimate if not an unquestioned authority. So his vivid story of the Celtic incursions not only stirs the blood but it fills a gap in history. Withal the old pedant more than once forgets himself in the patriot—a character of which we already begin to be conscious as we follow him from the Dipylon to the Academy along that street of soldiers' graves and see him stop to make a note like this: "Here are buried Conon and Timotheus, a glorious father and a glorious son, like Miltiades and Cimon before them." But the patriot has learned many a sad lesson when, in summing up Achaean history, he tells us how "like a fresh shoot on a blasted and withered trunk, the Achaean League rose on the ruins of Greece."

If our estimate of Pausanias is just, the wonder is not that he has now found an editor as patient and painstaking as himself, but that he has had to wait so long for his coming. The nearest approach to an exhaustive commentary hitherto is Leake's *Travels in Greece*—a monumental work by a master of topography who has never yet been matched; but Leake travelled and wrote before the revelations of the spade had fairly begun. In Curtius's *Peloponnesos* we have a more brilliant commentary, so far as it goes. But the editors proper had hardly got beyond Attica, when Mr. Frazer stepped to the front with an edition of Pausanias more complete in its way perhaps than had yet been achieved in the case of any ancient author. In this long labor of fourteen years—as long a labor, possibly, as Pausanias's own—we have everything an editor could offer us except the primary thing, the original text; and that exception we regret. We could have better spared the long appendix on "the Pre-Persian Temple" (which is here reprinted), and the entire text could have been printed in the index volume without swelling it beyond the average.



In his translation Mr. Frazer has achieved a very difficult task in a masterly way. Pausanias's style is hardly as hideous as his editor paints it—"a loose, clumsy, ill-jointed, ill-compacted, rickety, ram-shackle style without ease or grace or elegance of any sort"—but it is certainly about as bad a style as any Greek, even a modern Greek, could employ. For this crabbed Greek our translator gives us idiomatic, lucid, often racy English: thus "Demosthenes never fingered a penny of the gold that Harpalus brought from Asia" (ii, 33, 4); "King Archidamus himself had a finger in the sacred pie" at Delphi (iv, 10, 3); and "when Demaratus was born his father, Aristo [who, as we are subsequently told, 'had wedded the foulest maid and fairest wife in Lacedaemon'] blurted out some silly words about the brat not being his" (iii, 4, 4). These vivacities are not unwelcome on the dusty way we travel; but there are turns we frankly detest, such as "Market Zeus," "Horse Poseidon," "Locust Apollo," "Diver-Bird Athena" and so on through the whole pantheon of epithets. Still Mr. Frazer is not seduced by his own style, but reproduces his author with substantial if not slavish fidelity, while he clears a thousand stumbling-blocks out of the reader's path. Where none but the seasoned archaeologist could find any comfort in the original, a multitude of laymen who care for Greek things may read this translation with unflagging interest and real pleasure. It ought to be accessible to such readers in a volume by itself, together with the proper index and the admirable introduction which precedes it.

The commentary which takes up four stout volumes (aggregating 2,319 pages) is nothing less than encyclopedic. It embodies a digest of the immense literature of travel, research and excavation, down to 1897, as well as notes of the editor's own journeys in Greece in 1890 and 1895. We have some 450 pages on Athens alone, 260 on Olympia, and 160 on Delphi—the last enriched by the official plan of the French excavations still in progress there, with heliograph reproductions of the Frieze of the Siphnian Treasury, and Robert's restorations of Polygnotus's famous paintings of the Capture of Troy and the Netherworld. It may be remarked, in passing, that the apparatus of plans and maps throughout the work is abundant and excellent, though as much can hardly be said for the text-illustrations. So, while the index to the translation is very full, that to the commentary is painfully meagre. Where Pausanias dismisses Mycenae with two scant pages, mainly of legendary lore, Frazer gives us seventy pages of commentary in his text and ten more in his Addenda. Not content with telling us what Schliemann and Tsountas have actually found there, he goes on to sum up the progress of Mycenaean discovery at large and to discuss the ancient civilization thus brought to light. The whole exposition is worthy of a specialist, and it shows perhaps as well as any other instance how completely our editor has mastered his material. It is indeed surprising how thoroughly he has exploited the very latest literature of his subject. Thus he avails himself of our new Bacchylides in advance of Kenyon's *editio princeps* for an excellent note (V. 390); though, with the proof of "The Youths and Theseus" in



hand, he should have mended his translation of i, 17, 3 where Pausanias's tense (*ἔστιν*) is to be taken strictly as the poem shows. While he modestly confesses to "being an expert in none of the branches of archaeology," he is certainly well up in most of them; and he does not hesitate to argue the point with the accredited masters, as when he takes issue with Doerpfeld on the "Old Temple," the Enneakrounos, and the Greek stage.

Merely as a compendious record of archaeological research from the first great campaigns at Mycenae and Olympia to those now in progress at Delphi and Corinth, this work is invaluable; but it goes further and pours floods of light and learning on every topic that Pausanias touched, and their name is legion. We can refer here only to the folklore which is always cropping out in the old *periegete* and which never fails to set his editor off on excursions to the ends of the earth—as when he bags the forty-one variations of the Virgin and the Dragon tale (V. 143 f.) or the twenty-eight versions of the Clever Thief (V. 176 ff.). Readers of the "Golden Bough," in which Mr. Frazer had already devoted two volumes as bulky as any of these six to the elucidation of a single obscure Italian cult, will readily understand the zest with which he fares afield whenever game of this kind is scented.

It is to be regretted that, in another sense, he fares afield so little. You cannot well edit a traveller in your study, even though its "windows look on the tranquil court of an ancient college." The ideal editor of Pausanias should have first of all the qualification of Leake—he should have retraced every footstep of his author; but Mr. Frazer appears to have devoted seven years to his task before ever setting foot in Greece. Now we rightly insist on first-hand description in our author and we can ask no less of his editor. But here we have in his text (II. 448 ff.) an account of Rhamnus, written in the style of an eye-witness, but obviously compiled "in the still air of delightful studies" so feelingly alluded to in his preface. For on turning to his Addenda (V. 529), we read: "I visited Rhamnus 18th December, 1895, and found that the description given in the text needs to be corrected in a few points;" and he proceeds to make at least ten material corrections. Other instances occur where second-hand descriptions in the text are helped out in the Addenda by subsequent observations of his own; and some important sites (for example, Pylus and Sphacteria) he would seem not to have visited at all. Wherever he has used his own eyes, Mr. Frazer's observation is so fresh and his descriptions so charming as to deepen our regret that more of his work was not done on the spot.

Of the admirable introduction—the quintessence of the whole matter—we have left little time to speak. Nothing better has ever been written on the subject, and whoever reads it will not stop there. He will read Pausanias and find every page lit up with a "light that never was on sea or land"—the glamour which invests forever all things that are Greek.

J. IRVING MANATT.

*The Empire and the Papacy* (918-1273). By T. F. TOUT, M.A., Professor of History at the Owens College, Victoria University, Manchester. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. vii, 526.)

THE function of Mr. Tout among the writers in the Macmillan series of "Periods of European History" was to make a book of some five hundred pages on the period from 918, where Mr. Oman's volume ends, to 1273, where the next writer takes up the work. He desired, he says, in the absence of any sufficiently full existing text-book, to cover as much of the whole ground as his space allowed, but has in fact limited himself to narrating, with some amount of detail, the political and ecclesiastical history of Germany, France and the Eastern Empire. This is a very considerable programme and on the whole Mr. Tout has carried it out with fair success. The student will find in the twenty-one chapters a little something about almost everything. There are fourteen maps, showing in black and white the territorial divisions referred to in the text. There are ten genealogical tables, an appendix giving tables of rulers, references to literature and a sufficient index. What more can one ask in a text-book?

There are two ideals in the writing of text-books, either of which if carefully followed may produce good results. The book should be the overflow of the learning and insight of a thorough scholar or else it should grow naturally out of the need and experience of a successful teacher. The present volume corresponds to neither of these ideals. The author has evidently read a good deal in standard histories and in many of the most recent treatises on special epochs. He has profited by this reading so well that no one is likely to be led far astray by any of his presentations of fact. Yet at the same time one cannot feel that he has a mastery of his period which enables him to put the selected facts together in such a way as to give an impression of continuity or necessary relationship. He attempts a continuous narration, but there is no "go" in it. He is a victim of the desire to write flowing English, which is the bane of English historical book-makers. His style ambles withal, but the gait is monotonous to weariness. On one page we find five sentences introduced by "now." The number of clauses connected by "while" is beyond counting. This dreary monotony of style corresponds to the lack of color in the choice of what is to be told. Here is a typical passage: "Frederick II. was just twenty years old when the death of Innocent III. allowed him to govern as well as to reign. He was of middle height and well-proportioned, though becoming somewhat corpulent as he advanced in age. He had good features and a pleasant appearance. His light hair, like that of his father and grandfather, inclined toward redness, but he ultimately became very bald." Really our youth can do without this kind of thing, especially where space is precious.

Another legitimate demand on the modern text-book is that it shall lead the mind of the student out into larger fields of inquiry. It must

suggest vastly more than it says. Tried by this test Mr. Tout comes again very far short of what we may rightly expect. His bibliographical references, put in the form of occasional foot-notes, are too meagre to be of service to any one, and are of the most hap-hazard description. For example: the only works referred to about Hildebrand are Stephens (Epoch), Bowden and Villemain! Far better would be no bibliographies at all. There is hardly any suggestion of original sources. "Otto of Freising is a first-rate original chronicler" is almost the only reference of the kind. All names of books mentioned are without date of publication.

It is of course impossible for a book of this size to go into the endless controversies of special scholarship; but it may well bring some of them to the attention of students. It will thus avoid that fatal effect of knowing it all, which is so deadening to the mind of youth. This book does next to nothing of this work and loses thus one of its best opportunities. As an aid to the student in gaining a wider outlook the book is valueless.

We can have no quarrel with the due emphasis upon leading personalities, but such reference must be to things important in their effect upon the movement of history. We ought to be well beyond that conception of history which begot such phrases as "The king, enraged at," or "the duke, flushed with." Let us tell our students what happened and, in so far as we can, why it happened and what came of it, and be content if we can do that.

Almost every paragraph in the introduction suggests fruitful points of controversy, but we call attention only to the word "transition" and its questionable application to this period, which is marked, if ever any period was, by perfectly definable and persistent institutions. Unless we are to give up the word altogether, we must apply it where it belongs, to the period just preceding and to that just following the one here described. Those are transitions from something to something.

*Township and Borough*: being the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford in 1897, together with an appendix of notes relating to the history of the town of Cambridge. By FREDERIC WILLIAM MAITLAND, LL.D. (Cambridge: The University Press. 1898. Pp. ix, 220.)

RESEARCH in the field of English municipal history has long been hampered by the need of good printed collections of town records and by the scarcity of scholarly monographs on the constitutional development of particular boroughs. Within the past ten or fifteen years a few well-edited volumes of records have appeared, but there has not yet been published a single complete and detailed history of any borough. Though there are probably more than a hundred thousand books on English local history, including works on counties, towns, manors, churches, etc., many of which contain valuable material, few of them furnish a good critical account of local institutions. For example, Cooper's *An-*

*nals of Cambridge* is mainly an abstract of local records, which the author of *Township and Borough* has turned to account. The contrast in the workmanship of these two books is striking. The one gives us annalistic notes, while the other traces the growth of institutional life. Professor Maitland has, in fact, rendered a distinct service by writing a book which should teach students of local history proper methods of investigation. If his work should stimulate the production of other monographs on particular towns, similar to his own or more comprehensive in scope, the task of the future historian who undertakes a general treatise on English municipal development will be greatly lightened. Indeed, until more has been accomplished in connection with the investigation of institutions in particular boroughs, a satisfactory history of English municipalities cannot be written.

Professor Maitland's main theme is the growth of municipal incorporation in Cambridge. He begins by emphasizing the rustic basis of this and other large boroughs. Such rusticity is visible throughout the Middle Ages and far into modern times. Even London still had its arable fields in the twelfth century, and many boroughs seem to have been greatly concerned about their agrarian interests at a much later time. The history of boroughs thus involves the study of fields and pastures. Since the thirteenth century there slowly emerges an important distinction between the borough community and the village community: the former is corporate, the latter is not. "Corporateness came of urban life." Modern writers, by overestimating the number of inhabitants in the villages, by eliminating the lord from consideration as a unifying element, and by underrating the automatic, self-adjusting scheme of the old agricultural system, have ascribed too much corporateness, too much collective ownership and governmental unity, to the village. The principle which originally served to mark off the borough from the village was the special royal peace conferred upon fortified places. The borough was, indeed, the centre of the shire for military, judicial, and commercial purposes: it was "the stronghold, the market, and the moot-stow of the shire." The king exercised lordship over the borough, which, however, was no royal manor; he was the lord, but not the manorial lord; many of the burgesses were dependent on other lords. With the development of commerce the burgesses ceased to be self-supporting agriculturists, though many of them continued to eke out a revenue derived from trade by growing a little grain in the fields. The land then became a mobile, saleable commodity: "the market has mobilized the land; the land is in the market." The proprietary scheme of the acre-strips ceased to have regularity and equality; they were no longer united into hides and virgates. The people of Cambridge gave more than half their land to religious houses in the twelfth and following centuries, and the rest passed rapidly from hand to hand by purchase. Land and houses were sold or bequeathed like chattels. Therefore mesne tenure lost its political importance, for the landlord was deprived of his right of escheat, and became simply a man with a rent-charge.

The last two lectures deal with the growth of municipal incorporation, especially in Cambridge. We are told that the *firma burgi* did not imply the corporate liability of the borough for the annual rent due to the crown, but that the bailiffs of the town were really responsible for its payment. Though all the burgesses were liable to the king, the bailiffs were expected to make good any deficit in the revenues which they collected to satisfy the fee-farm rent; if, on the other hand, they made a profit, they spent it in a common banquet or in a drinking-bout. Professor Maitland says that the main reason for allowing the burgesses to have the town at farm was to free the borough court from the sheriff's control. This statement may be correct, but it requires explanation, for there seems to be much evidence to show that the main advantage of this privilege was to free the burgesses from the sheriff's interference in fiscal matters. Was not the burghal moot, "the one old organ of the borough," under the control of the town officers long before *firma burgi* was granted to the burgesses? But this question does not affect the author's main line of thought. With his usual skill and learning he shows how the definite idea of corporate ownership of land appears in Cambridge about the middle of the fourteenth century, when bits of waste or "common" began to be leased by the borough. "The Town that seals leases, that takes rents, is becoming a person; it is ascending from the 'lower case' and demands a capital T." In modern times the corporation becomes "both *persona ficta* and a Tory dining club."

In the appendix, which forms more than half the volume, many matters of interest relating to Cambridge are ably investigated. The book as a whole deserves high praise. By looking "beyond wall and ditch to the arable fields and the green meadows of the town," Professor Maitland has broken new ground, and has done much to advance the study of municipal history.

CHARLES GROSS.

*History of England under Henry the Fourth.* By JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A. Vol. IV., 1411-1413. (London, New York and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Pp. x, 575.)

MR. WYLIE, in the preface to this his concluding volume, rather disarms criticism on those points which have met with such general disapproval in his former volumes by treating his work, notwithstanding its title, as principally intended to provide material for later historians. We can, therefore, only state our difference of opinion from his in the two points he defends, the desirability of such minute detail in a general history, and the realistic effect produced by including in his narrative a large number of strange contemporary words and expressions; and then pass on to a recognition of the various excellencies of his book. This last volume includes only about a hundred pages of text, all the remainder being given up to appendices, glossary, and index. The amount of new information is, therefore, naturally not great, but the account of the rela-



tions of England with the Hanse towns and the Teutonic Order is very interesting. Not that any conclusion to the current disputes was reached. On the contrary, the very impracticability of establishing any stable equilibrium throws much light on the rising ambitions of English traders, on the semi-independence of the English towns, and on the failing fortunes of the Hanse and the Order. When English merchants were fighting their way into all harbors in accordance with a manifest destiny to become world-traders, there was little probability that there would be a cessation of armed frays with traders of other nations who had long been used to a monopoly in these same harbors. So long as English merchant vessels had to arm and defend themselves, the merchants of English towns were not likely to pay to foreign claimants indemnity for their losses in these irregular combats, no matter how often they were so commanded by the King and Council.

In other chapters the detailed account of official events brings out clearly here, as it has in the earlier volumes, how continuous the friction with France was, how incomplete had been the suspension of the "Hundred Years' War." The campaign of Henry V., in 1415, was not a deliberate renewal of a closed-up war, but simply a repetition of recent expeditions, although, of course, more extensive, more deliberate, and more vigorous. The plans for a renewal had never been suffered to sleep by either side. We have next a discussion of the obscure estrangement between the King and the Prince of Wales during the King's last year, and of the stories of the Prince's youthful wildness. Mr. Wylie is inclined to give these stories more credit than they sometimes receive, though he rejects, of course, those of his participation in sportive highway robbery. A fuller discussion is given to the story of his committal to prison by the outraged chief-justice, and the author decides for the acceptance of it, though he acknowledges the absence of actual contemporary testimony.

A work that follows on the whole such a definite line of official history can hardly find much of a dramatic conclusion in the last days of Henry IV. Weakened and made repulsive in appearance by some strange wasting illness he gradually withdrew from his labors, fainted one day during his devotions in Westminster Abbey, and died in the adjoining "Jerusalem Chamber." The details that Mr. Wylie gives of the embalment and burial of the king are interesting, but throw into relief the cyclopedic rather than historical character of the work. His last chapter, devoted to a careful summary of the personal appearance, character, and abilities of Henry, furnishes a somewhat depressing commentary on the method of writing history without any generalizations, any theories, or any outlook.

But the really serious part of this volume, as has been said, lies in the additions rather than in the narrative. The index covers the matter of all the four volumes and is of surpassing length, detail, and excellence. It covers more than two hundred pages, includes the notes as well as the text, and, in the peculiar method adopted by Mr. Wylie in his writing,



furnishes the key to the value of the book. An enormous amount of accurate information and reference for almost all sides of English life in the early fifteenth century is here put at the command of scholars, and one almost feels ashamed of any criticism of the manner of writing a history when he sees the wealth of matter on which it is based, and realizes what a vast amount of labor is represented by its collection. The trust which the author expresses that the work of future historians will be lightened by his labors will certainly be justified. The same remarks are in a slightly less degree applicable to the glossary of rare and obsolete words. There are besides some thirty appendices of varying interest and value.

The variety and extent of the sources from which Mr. Wylie was drawing his information has been noticeable since the publication of the first volume. The principal bibliography, however, is in the second volume, the third containing only books not already mentioned, and this last volume including the list of manuscript sources, with extracts from some of them published as an appendix. These bibliographical lists are somewhat miscellaneous. Contemporary and later works are placed in the same list, although distinguished, not always quite accurately, by a sign. Again, some of the works cited are inclusive of others in the same list. Foreign and native writers are not distinguished. These defects in what is otherwise a remarkable bibliographical list call attention to the deficiencies in bibliographies generally. Reviewers have long made the lack of an index a matter of rebuke. But the bibliography is as a general thing the most slovenly part of even an excellent book. Frequently there is no bibliographical information whatever, as in Stubbs's *Constitutional History*. An uncritical unannotated list of all the books that have been examined or quoted is often all that is given in a book that may be far above the average of scholarly work. On the other hand there are few if any easier or more effective ways in which an author can help his successors in the same field. Lists are in general entirely too long. Many books have not a thing in them which is not included in some other book. It is pure waste to leave a second student to go laboriously through the two books to find this out. Bibliographical lists are too indiscriminate. Many books which a student has felt bound to examine he has found to be worthless. He ought to say so for the benefit of others. Secondary and primary sources should never be placed in such juxtaposition as to obscure the difference of their degree of authority. A short statement of contents or character, a few words of comment or criticism, some information about editions, accessibility, or reputation, would often be as valuable and interesting to those who read the book as they would be practicable and easy to the one who wrote it. These remarks are made not because Mr. Wylie is an especially great sinner in such respects, but because in every other way the equipment of his books is so excellent, and because his bibliographical material itself is so extensive and could readily have been made so useful.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

*The History of English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century.*

By G. P. GOOCH, M.A. (Cambridge: University Press. 1898. Pp. viii, 363.)

THIS work, the author says in his preface, is the first attempt yet made to relate the story of English democratic thinking in the seventeenth century, although intended "to do no more than direct attention to the salient points of the story." It contains an introduction and ten chapters, the introduction and first chapter forming a brief study of democratic thought prior to the seventeenth century.

The origin of the modern democratic idea appears in the mind of the author to lie wholly in the sixteenth century, and in the Reformation. It is difficult to accept this statement in its entirety, as it excludes all prior influences such as the rise of free cities, and, especially, all economic factors.

The relation of the Huguenot movement to the progress of democratic thought receives considerable attention and a valuable mass of material is indicated in the notes. As to the growth of democratic ideas in England before the seventeenth century (Chapter I.), we have a very satisfactory examination of Wyclif, of More, and of later writers like Poynt and Goodman, Knox and Buchanan.

The section on The Birth of Independency rightly judges of the importance and genius of the Brownist movement and suggests some new ideas as to Robert Brown's place in the whole agitation. Holland's place in the growth of independency, and the inoculation of English religious bodies with Dutch ideas and ideals are exceedingly well put. The chapter on New England is not entirely satisfactory. The influence of the New Plymouth colony on colonies subsequently founded is exaggerated, while the principle of criticism that ought to be applied to Massachusetts Bay is that its true influence is found not in its intention but in its result. In regard to Rhode Island and Roger Williams, the work shows a somewhat superficial treatment. In fact, New England and the English colonies as a whole had far greater influence upon the growth of democratic ideas than this account would indicate.

The section on The Eve of Revolution is the most spirited bit of writing in the book, but Mr. Gooch's treatment of Democratic Constitutionalism, and Presbyterianism and its Critics, in Chapter III., lacks clearness. Not so with the section on The New Radicalism which ends the chapter. It contains some admirable generalizations and a very accurate account of the effect of the many new religious sects upon democracy. The degree to which the millenarian idea had permeated all the radical sects, the junction of this idea with Antinomianism, and the relation of the Independents to the more radical of these religious sects is, perhaps, nowhere else so satisfactorily stated.

The chapter on the Political Opinions of the Army (Chapter IV.) is valuable both for the author's discussion and for the material collected and classified in the notes. The treatment of the Levellers and of Ire-

ton is especially suggestive. One of the best portions of the book is the chapter devoted to The Antagonists of the Oligarchy, *i. e.*, the Levellers and Communists, the section on the latter being especially new and valuable.

In Cromwell's Political Principles we have nothing particularly new, yet the material is so arranged as to give, together with some previous paragraphs, a strikingly clear picture of the progress of the Protector's political thought; of his conservatism and his opposition to the doctrine of "The Law of Nature" in the agitation of 1645 and 1646; of the truth that "Oliver came very slowly to the knowledge of his abilities." In general, the estimate of Cromwell's relation to political thought is accurate, except that here again all economic considerations are left out.

There is in Chapter VIII. a very satisfactory examination of the new religious bodies—the Millenarians, the Baptists and the Quakers, and of their attitude toward the Protectorate. The close affiliation between the Baptists and the Quakers in the early stages of the Quaker movement is clearly shown.

On the whole, the book is a valuable addition to English historical writing, although it contains several portions that ought to be critically examined before their conclusions are accepted, and although it leaves economic considerations entirely out of view. It is stimulating to thought and the style is, on the whole, clear and spirited. The notes are short but abundant, point the way to a great mass of material, and form one of the best features of the book. This material which, although mostly known to students, has never before been grouped with reference to this subject, has been, in general, accurately sifted and critically used.

We should say, therefore, that the greatest value of the work lay in collecting in a fairly exhaustive way the original material on the subject; in sifting this material and in grouping it in correct proportion; and in correctly showing the sequence in, and relations between, the separate facts connected with the democratic thought of the seventeenth century.

FRANK STRONG.

*La Formation de la Prusse Contemporaine.* Par GODEFROY CAVAIGNAC. Tome Second: Le Ministère de Hardenberg, Le Soulèvement; 1808–1813. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1898. Pp. vii, 517.)

THE earlier volume of M. Cavaignac's work was devoted to the period of the ministry of Stein. Stein had laid out a scheme of reform which was designed to transform Prussia, but, like Turgot's reforms in France, this gained its chief importance rather from what it suggested of future possibilities than from what was actually accomplished by its author. To take up and in some measure complete Stein's reforms was the work of Hardenberg. M. Cavaignac finds that Hardenberg's policy embraced three chief points: to accomplish an economic revolution whereby individual effort should be emancipated, to substitute for the

predominance of the great feudal holders the power of the middle classes, and to replace the system of "decentralized oligarchy" by a system of centralization on the French model. The present volume covers the period down to the middle of 1813. It includes, therefore, the reorganization of the Prussian military system which made the war of liberation possible.

Hardenberg found two great obstacles in his way, the feebleness and vacillation of the king, and the overzealousness of the patriotic party. The latter would have preferred an immediate national uprising against Napoleon to the slow process of building up the national strength with the idea of insuring the ultimate success of such an uprising. Frederick William III. was not the type of sovereign suited to a time so critical as that which followed Jena. In constant terror of Napoleon's disfavor on one side and of too great concessions to popular government on the other, he was a hindrance to both patriots and reformers.

Chapter II. deals with the reorganization of the national finances. The author demonstrates the falsity of the prevalent impression that these reforms were of a revolutionary character. They were rather an "adaptation" than a new creation. Much of inequality and special privilege remained, but it was from the privileged classes themselves that the principal opposition to the measures came. Curiously enough, too, a considerable section of the patriotic party opposed them because they were distinctly French in character.

Upon the question of representative government Hardenberg and Stein were in complete accord. Neither dreamed of weakening the royal authority. Stein recommended to Hardenberg the principles of Richelieu as a model,—certainly, as our author remarks, "a bad beginning for the establishment of the constitutional régime." The economic reforms for which both had been laboring had been directed against the old class distinctions, and yet now it was proposed to base whatever of national representation was to be established on those very distinctions. The national representative body was to be little more than an enlarged edition of the provincial estates, with three orders, the landed aristocracy, the burgher class and the peasantry. Its powers were to be only consultative and advisory. M. Cavaignac is writing from the point of view of a Frenchman, to whom the results of the Revolution even in its earlier phases come as a matter of course, and it is not strange that his attitude toward this extreme conservatism of the most advanced Prussian statesmen of that day is one of surprise and pity.

With the extreme patriotic party Hardenberg's relations were necessarily of a secret nature. Prussia's position in 1811 was a desperately critical one. The very existence of the state was endangered by the suspicions of Napoleon. The patriots had secret relations with England. Scharnhorst and Gneisenau were quietly carrying through those military reforms that were to make Prussia able at last to bid defiance to Napoleon. To this military reorganization M. Cavaignac devotes several chapters. He rightly appreciates the importance of the formation of the *Landwehr*

as a military measure. But he sees in it a still higher significance, for it was also a "phenomenon of social discipline." In the study of this as of the other parts of his subject he has made a thorough use of the best authorities. He has not always deemed it necessary to go to the original sources for his facts, and has freely used the standard histories like those of Häusser, Lehmann and Droysen. In the appendix he has reproduced several original documents, mostly from French sources. The book is evidently one written with the purpose of making Frenchmen better acquainted with the formation of the state which, as their chief enemy, they ought to understand; but the author has not sacrificed either his historical truth or historical perspective in carrying out this purpose.

ULYSSES G. WEATHERLY.

*Modern France, 1789-1895.* By ANDRÉ LEBON. [The Story of the Nations.] (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. ix, 488.)

It is our impression that most readers will lay down this book with a sense of mild disappointment. The volume has a tasteful appearance, but the coarse board under the cloth is heavy, and in the new copy given by a friend to the reviewer had warped so as to split the cloth; the paper is heavily loaded, the plates, presumably new, already give a blurred impression of certain pages, and the illustrations—it is hard to imagine the service they have already rendered elsewhere. The text does not in any way compensate for the clumsiness and cheapness of the book. The translator has laboriously set down a verbal rendering of the original, and while the number of distinct Gallicisms is but small the entire contents are a witness to the truth of the Italian proverb, *Traduttore, Traditore*. A French author writing for his countrymen may go far on the road of condensation and generalization without becoming obscure, but among Englishmen and Americans it requires an expert in French history to grasp the sense of M. Lebon, as stated in many places among these pages. But we might put up with these drawbacks, with such phrases as "elective urn," "neorosis (*sic*) of the chambers," and "Nonjurant" wrested from its specific to a general meaning, with the "jurisdiction of juries," "superiority of guilty passion," "councils of discipline," "aureole of martyrdom," and other similar phrases, a harvest of which can be reaped throughout the book; from all such juxtapositions of words we might trust our mother-wit to get for us a vague meaning by means of the context, provided the labor and anxiety were worth while. But it is doubtful whether they are.

M. Lebon is probably a painstaking functionary; he appears also to be the ripe product of the over-charged programmes of the reorganized French colleges and universities. In fact on p. 365 he calls attention to his position, that of an active politician, as unfitting him for the task of a historian. He can only give "salient facts," he may not pronounce "circumstantial judgments" (whatever they may be), nor even enter into



"chronological details," a more mysterious realm. The character of his work testifies not only to the perfect sincerity of this confession, but likewise to the intellectual training he has had. All told there are four hundred and sixty-two pages of text; exactly a third, a hundred and fifty-four pages, is given up to a catalogue of the French celebrities of the period, men and women famous in literature, art, science, medicine and every other department of human activity. Of each the erudite author has an estimate; longer or shorter, according to renown, but a final estimate given without hesitation. Such a range of critical activity is afforded to few. The truth is that terseness like this is nugatory, not to say misleading, and such a display of mere knowledge is utterly un-historical.

Of the remaining three hundred and eight pages about two-fifths are occupied by writing which displays the essential vice of modern French life, namely, the criticism of the successive constitutions which throughout the epoch he essays to treat have been put on paper and inaugurated in practice, only to be rejected and discredited. M. Lebon's remarks are fair enough, but the proportion of space given to such considerations indicates that the hope of securing a constitution which by the magic of its working will remedy the evils of French life has not yet disappeared from the minds of French politicians. As they idealize their army into a superhuman power above criticism, so they still seek the ground of political stability in a paper of rights and regulations, in a theory as to the subdivision of powers, and as to an application of checks, balances, and regulations to administration. There will be no satisfactory political reformation in any people without an underlying social regeneration; unselfishness and loftiness of purpose may be furthered, but they cannot be created, by charters.

Finally, there remains the narrative of "salient facts." Concerning this it may be said that it must be read with caution. There are minor inaccuracies in the statements of facts and dates which may be passed over as slips due to haste. But it is distinctly misleading to say that "Bonaparte had recaptured Toulon," p. 39; that "the Directory allowed itself to be persuaded by its famous general" to undertake the Egyptian expedition, p. 63; that the revolt of "Romanticism against the philosophic spirit of the eighteenth century produced a religious revival," p. 259; that "the brute force of material interests" controls the direction of events, p. 259; that "the King of Prussia ordered his cousin to withdraw his candidature" to the Spanish throne, p. 335; or that "Liberals and simple Democrats alike were forced into opposition to the Church in order to deprive the reactionaries of their last refuge." These are but a few examples of how "salient facts" should not be stated; they are taken almost at hazard in turning the pages of the book.

But the careful reading of the book as a whole leaves more than discontent with details. Old France disappears, the Revolution begins, the Red Terror lifts its awful head, the organized demoralization of society appears in the Directory—all apparently without any causal nexus be-



tween social states, except that each suffered from a poor constitution. States of society succeed one another, thrones rise and fall, ministers appear and disappear, and we are left in darkness as to any sufficient reason, the author, as far as he is visible, being apparently a fatalist and pessimist, as he truly declares that most able Frenchmen are. We are told little or nothing about public opinion, except that on one occasion it was "nauseated," and about the great constructive elements which undoubtedly exist in the French life of the nineteenth century we get no adequate information at all. Of course there are some praiseworthy qualities in the effort of M. Lebon. He does not lose himself in details; he gives a useful outline of events in their sequence; he is fairly interesting. He may be a scientific thinker, and in his attempts to connect literature and life in their various phases there are indications that he has examined some questions with scientific curiosity. There prevails also in his work a sense of self-respect and a feeling of patriotism which command our admiration.

*Geschichte Europas seit den Verträgen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871.* Von ALFRED STERN. Zweiter Band. (Berlin: Wilhelm Hertz. 1897. Pp. xvi, 572.)

THE first volume of Dr. Stern's history of Europe since 1815 appeared in 1894 and at once won its way to the favor of scholars. In this, the second volume, published last year, the author has continued the narrative from the year 1820 to the year 1825, and has not only fully maintained the standard already established, but all things considered, *me judice*, has given us results of even greater interest and merit than were those presented in the first volume. This is due partly to the fact that the period dealt with abounds in dramatic situations and incidents, partly to the greater unity of the subject, which tends to hold the attention of the reader, and partly to the increasing wealth of material of a personal character—letters and the like—which the author has utilized in writing his book.

Dr. Stern begins his volume with a careful and elaborate account of the Spanish revolution of 1820, passes to that of Portugal of the same year, and then, crossing the sea to Italy, takes up the earlier phases of the Neapolitan uprising. He then examines the circumstances attending the calling of the congresses of Troppau and Laibach, and with two valuable chapters on the diplomatic efforts of Metternich, the deliberations of the plenipotentiaries, and the results of their meetings, completes his study of the first phase of the general revolutionary movement in Europe. He next describes the Greek revolution, devoting altogether nearly a quarter of the book (125 pages) to the history of this subject from 1820 to 1825; and in the midst of his narrative, having brought the Grecian movement to the year 1822, returns to the Spanish revolt, works out the situation in France, and by this path come to the calling of the congress of Verona and the intervention of the French in Spain. At the close of this chapter

he gives to the counter-revolution in Portugal a dozen pages, and then considers at length the reaction that followed the revolutions in Spain and Italy. Having completed this phase of his subject, the author turns northward, and for the first time engages himself with the history of Germany, touching but lightly the situation in the lesser states, and laying chief stress upon events in Prussia, the work of the various commissions on the constitution, and the final victory of the feudal element and the bureaucracy. At this point, in order to prepare the way for an intelligent discussion of England's influence upon the course of events in Greece, Dr. Stern devotes a chapter to the history of England. This finished, with the situation in the various countries well in hand (though no attempt is made to study Russian politics), the author continues the history of the Greek revolution to the death of Alexander I. and the disruption of the Holy Alliance. He closes his volume with a chapter on the movement in literature and an appendix of documents.

From this brief survey it will be seen that, notwithstanding the strictly chronological character of the treatment, there exists in the work a certain organic unity, which the first volume did not possess. This is due to the fact that the events of the period revolve about Metternich and the congresses, and that Dr. Stern has allowed this fact to determine the arrangement of his material. It is quite true that he discusses the political history of each state independently and in detail, yet inasmuch as the order of his topics is fixed by the course of events abroad, he leaves the impression that he is giving us the internal history of France and England, for example, not for the purpose of explaining the downfall of Richelieu and the policy of the Ultras, the trial of Queen Caroline and its political consequences, but rather that we may better understand the attitude of the countries toward the doctrine of intervention. And the method employed is justified in this volume by the solidarity of the European diplomacy of the period treated, and in the work as a whole by the fact that, written in large part from new and original material, it was necessary to construct it chronologically, line by line, even in every part. The work can never become a purely popular history; it is written in narrative fashion without any attempt at that philosophical or logical treatment which demands continuity, and is entirely free from personal comments, evidences of partisanship, and attempts at fine writing, such as make for shortness of life in an historical work.

In examining the material that Dr. Stern has employed, we find that it consists of letters, accounts, despatches and instructions of French, Prussian, Russian, Sardinian, Tuscan, and Austrian ambassadors, consuls-general, and special representatives; of the hitherto unpublished correspondence of prominent ministers and diplomatists, such as Metternich, Capodistrias, and Pasquier; of letters of royalty, of King Ferdinand of Naples and King Ferdinand of Spain, some of which are printed in the appendix. It is worthy of note that Dr. Stern records no material from the English archives. By means of the evidence thus obtained and with the aid of some recently published memoirs and monographs, the

author has been able to cast new light upon the doings of congresses and the motives of statesmen, to overthrow legends, to supplement memoirs or throw doubt upon them, and in a number of instances to correct errors in the writings of other historians. Note, for example, what he says regarding the legends that have clustered about the youth of Charles Albert, pp. 71, 72, 379; his use of new material to supplement or correct Baumgarten's history of Spain, pp. 20, 35, 119; and the wealth of new evidence that he has obtained for the study of the congresses of Troppau and Laibach and especially of Verona, pp. 129, 151, 292, 572. Some of these documents he had previously made accessible to scholars by publishing them in various journals, as Dalberg's draft of a constitution for Piedmont (1820) in *Rivista Storica del Risorgimento Italiano*; Strassoldo's letters to Metternich in the *Zeitschrift für Social- und Wirthschaftsgeschichte*; Hardenberg's memoir upon the Prussian constitution and Metternich's Troppau-memoir in the *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*; and others in the *Revue Historique* and *Historische Zeitschrift*. The appendix to the present volume contains a number of valuable documents, and one can only wish that Dr. Stern would edit a collection of sources and so make accessible a larger number of the documents that he himself has used.

Dr. Stern does not often express personal judgments, but when he does he is usually happy. Brief comments upon Metternich after Laibach (p. 180), upon the death of Richelieu (p. 265), upon Chateaubriand at Verona (p. 297), and upon the death of Hardenberg (pp. 385-386) show his skill in brief, epigrammatic character-drawing. Generally, however, he is content to let us judge the personality of the men of whom he treats by the work that they accomplished. He has eliminated himself and his own opinions almost entirely from his work; yet he is always interesting, because his method is simple, his treatment scholarly, his statements accurate. His work is attractive, not for its style, its literary qualities, its brilliant word-painting, or its tricks of presentation; it is simply narrative history, suggestively and impartially presented.

To complete the work at the present rate of progress will require more than thirty years in addition to the six or more already consumed. Dr. Stern has set for himself an enormous task, and the thought of Lanfrey, Sybel, Freeman, and others who have died in the harness is sure to arise and to make us wish for the author the blessing of a long life. But time and health are not the only desiderata; material is equally necessary. Access to official documents, which Dr. Stern has thus far used with such admirable judgment, will become more and more difficult as he advances in the century, for the European governments—except Prussia, and now alas! no longer Prussia,—have hitherto rigidly shut the door against any scientific treatment of recent history, and have forbidden the publication, except with the official *imprimatur*, of state papers concerning the last half-century. Time may remedy this and Dr. Stern may find the doors opening as he advances and may be able to utilize the archival material for the later period with the same success as he has the

earlier. If this should prove to be the case, the reader may well be content with the slowness of the publication.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission of the American Historical Association, 1896.* [Ext. from the Report of the American Historical Association for 1896.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1897 [1898]. Pp. 463-1107.)

IN 1895 the Executive Council of the American Historical Association appointed an Historical Manuscripts Commission to edit, index, or collect information in regard to unprinted documents relating to American history. Professor Jameson, who had for several years advocated and worked for the establishment of such a body, was fitly made chairman. The other members of the Commission as originally appointed were Mr. Douglas Brymner, Mr. Talcott Williams, and Professors Trent and Turner. The first Report of the Commission is now before the public. The main part of this report consists of six parcels of hitherto unpublished material, five of which vividly illustrate the political feeling and methods, the economic wants and interests of the principal divisions of the country in the formative period of our nation-life, 1783-1800. The remaining parcel contains some intercepted letters purporting to be written by an officer in the English army in 1756 to the Duke de Mirepoix proposing to betray the English interests in the West to the French if the necessary money is provided. These documents seem to me the least valuable in the Report. Mr. Brymner in his introduction is very non-committal on the question of their authenticity. "These and other facts," he says, "give a greater color of probability to the authenticity" of these letters. Although I have not studied them closely enough to venture a very positive opinion, I am inclined to think they are merely, in the words of Halifax, "an artifice to draw a little money from France." The bragging tone and the inconsistencies in the narrative arouse one's suspicions. The complete uncertainty of any fact alleged in these letters that is not elsewhere confirmed makes their value slight at best. Halifax conjectured that the writer was an Irishman because the spelling seems to indicate an Irish pronunciation. Professor Jameson has arrived at the same conclusion. It seems to me, however, that the French idioms in the writer's English indicate that he was a Frenchman who had acquired a good command of colloquial English, but who was not secure from an occasional lapse to native forms of expression. If he learned his English from Irishmen the peculiarities of his spelling are accounted for. On the other hand, the French idioms are of a kind that no foreigner would acquire. For example, p. 664, "I've some time ago, been very ill used by the English Governours here have within these 15 days, been solicited to be at the head of a considerable army," etc. The use of "15 days" instead of "fortnight" seems to me an almost convincing indication that the writer was thinking partly in French or else that the

present text is a translation of a French original. Cf. this phrase on p. 671, "a few days ago, there has been at New York a Congress."

The contrast between the baffling vagueness of these letters and the throbbing life of those relating to the plan of the French Republic in 1792-3 to recover Louisiana and to revolutionize the Spanish colonies is striking. In these documents, partly derived from the Draper collection in the possession of the Wisconsin Historical Society and partly copied for the Commission from the originals in the French Archives we see well-known historical characters working at a train of events of enormous possible consequence, too vast, in fact, for the means at the disposal of the conspirators. On one side it is the prelude to Napoleon's recovery of Louisiana and the cession of it to the United States, and, in another aspect, the prelude to Burr's conspiracy. As the Revolutionary committee on legislation laid the solid foundations of the Code Napoleon, so the origin of Napoleon's Louisiana policy is traced back beyond Talleyrand to the earlier days of the Revolution, to Brissot and the unknown author of the "*Plan proposé pour faire une révolution dans la Louisiane*" who tells us that he had tried in 1787 to interest the old government in the project.

Professor Turner's able study of the origin and development of this great design in the July number of the REVIEW precludes any extended comment on the new facts disclosed by these documents, but one or two remarks may be ventured. In regard to Genet's mission, it is not too much to say, that the accounts of it in our histories and lectures must be entirely reconstructed. Hitherto we have missed the essential and momentous elements, and made merry or become sarcastic over the indiscretions and impertinences of the youthful French minister. Again in these letters the old truth that only steam transportation has made a permanent union of the states possible receives new and vivid illustration. With both Frenchmen and Westerners it seems an accepted fact that nature designed the Mississippi valley for a political unit; that its interests were too diverse and that it was too remote from the coast states to find in union with them the fulfillment of its destiny; and that the working of those same forces which two generations later made inevitable the failure of the South to divide this unit and to establish a new power in control of the lower waters of the Mississippi, was destined to wreck the Spanish power on the Gulf. So both Frenchmen and Westerners vie with each other in uging on the crisis and in preparing to seize the fragments. The plot unfolds itself with dramatic intensity, and one cannot help a twinge of disappointment at its collapse. The story, too, is not without its humor, as may be seen from the delicious Wellerism of old De Pauw in his account of the untimely end of La Chaise, one of the conspirators. "But he has meet with the unhappy corcimstance of Lössing his existence, by the parting of his head from his body, by the gal-loutinne under the name of gonbo Lachase which name he bor in franch before by coming from the mississippie, which is the name of a dich made in that country (Our)inds all lachase Exploys." When I add that



this worthy's French was hardly more literate than his English, the reader will second the suggestion that the editor might now and then have permitted himself to provide a gloss to smooth or hasten our progress. Take for example this sentence, p. 980. "ses habitans sont en general bons soldats et j'ateste quil mobien de fois communiquer qui ferons tout leur possible de bouleverser le gouvernement espagnole."

The selections from the communications which Phineas Bond, the British consul to the Middle States, sent to his home authorities, give us a valuable picture of our critical period. Bond, formerly a Loyalist of the higher type, now doubly devoted to the mother country through persecution, reveals the breaches that natural commercial interests were making in the old colonial system. He records with no little apprehension the migration of British artisans, the surreptitious importation of machinery, and the beginnings of that China trade which brought so much wealth to Massachusetts, and which was for a time almost the only resource of her merchants after independence had shut us out from the British system. The demoralizing effects of the revolutionary war, the profound commercial depression which followed, and the alarm as to the future in the minds of all thoughtful citizens are vividly depicted by this not unfriendly observer.

That the formation and adoption of the Constitution is to be viewed as a conservative reaction from the Revolution is enforced as clearly in the letters of the Boston merchant Stephen Higginson as it is in those of the British consul. In both, also, the economic historian will find useful material and effective illustrations. For the student of politics these Higginson letters deserve a place beside the Wolcott correspondence as a mirror of New England Federalism.

A companion picture of South Carolina politics early in this century is presented in the selections from the diaries of Edward Hooker, who, after his graduation from Yale, spent several years in the South as teacher. Among the interesting features of this diary are the reports of the discussions in the legislature on the suppression of the slave trade, the accounts of the prevalent venality of offices, of electioneering, of the duplicate voting in different counties by the large landholders, and the observations on the population. We think of South Carolina as having a fairly homogeneous white population, but to this Connecticut youth in 1805 the people of the state seemed as heterogeneous a mixture of foreigners as is now to be found in one of our western farming states.

Too high praise cannot be given for the thorough and scholarly manner in which these documents have been prepared for publication by the editors, Professor Jameson and, for the Genet-Clark papers, Professor Turner. The introductions are models of their kind, conveying in concise form the essential information for an adequate appreciation of each document. The editors' notes are equally painstaking and excellent. Other valuable features of the *Report* are the index of documents relating to the Genet-Clark expedition, the calendar of Stephen Higginson's correspondence so far as published in the *Report* or elsewhere, and the ex-



tremely useful "List of Printed Guides to and Descriptions of Archives in the United States and Canada" which was prepared under the editor's suggestion by Dr. E. C. Burnett of Brown University. Altogether this first report is one in which the Commission may justly take pride, and for which historical students will be warmly grateful. The Commission has proved its usefulness in the most convincing manner, and its future publications will be awaited with lively interest.

In closing, I should like to urge the publication of future reports in separate volumes. This entire report, comprising nearly 650 pages, is crowded into Vol. I. of the current *Report of the Historical Association* as Art. XXI. That tome is thereby swollen to the dimensions of a dictionary. If the Report of the Manuscripts Commission had been printed in a volume by itself, like Professor Ames's prize essay, it would have presented a better appearance and have been more convenient to use.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.

*The Voyages of the Cabots; Latest Phases of the Controversy.* By SAMUEL EDWARD DAWSON, Litt.D. (Laval). [From the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada for 1897.] (Ottawa: James Hope and Co. 1897. Pp. 130, 3 maps.)

*John and Sebastian Cabot; The Discovery of North America.* By C. RAYMOND BEAZLEY, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1898. Pp. xx, 311.)

*Cabot's Discovery of North America.* By G. E. WEARE. (London: Macqueen. 1897. Pp. xi, 343, 12 maps and plates.)

It is not easy for one living far from the fields of strife to appreciate the passionate bitterness of disagreement, which has characterized much of the recent discussion of the historical problems associated with the careers of John and Sebastian Cabot. At Oxford, apparently, according to a communication in the *English Historical Review* for January last, Mr. E. J. Payne has been subjected to "odium and some coarse personal vituperation" for holding certain curious notions which continue to be contrary to the received opinion. In Newfoundland and Eastern Canada, the Cabot landfall controversy has raged with terrible earnestness, of which a faint after-glow is discernible on the pages of Dr. Dawson's review of the latest phases of the discussion.

In 1894, Dr. S. E. Dawson of Ottawa prepared for the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Canada an elaborate treatise, in which he undertook to establish the location of the spot whereon English feet first trod the soil of North America. Mr. Harisse of Paris had previously shown, with great learning, that every sixteenth-century map which offers any information upon this subject, with a single exception, describes Labrador as the country discovered by Englishmen from Bristol. This discovery was made by Cabot in 1497, and there are three or four documents dated in that year, which contain everything which is now known with

certainty in regard to what was actually accomplished by him. The data embodied in these documents prove conclusively that the newly found land was markedly different in every noticeable respect from the inhospitable coasts of Labrador. Having thus shown the impossibility of a Labrador landfall Dr. Dawson next discovered that a mere assumption of probability is the only basis for the claims on behalf of Newfoundland, upon whose shores it had been supposed for more than two hundred years that the English voyager westward-bound might most naturally find his first landing-place. Continuing his studies, Dr. Dawson found that the descriptions of the landfall, as reported by Cabot, applied perfectly well to the country of Cape Breton.

7 1508  
A statement which is said to have been authorized by Sebastian Cabot mentions an island of St. John lying over against the landfall. An island of this name appears on many early maps, and Dr. Dawson published a series of tracings and sketches from these, which enabled him to produce a very strong presumption that the original of this island lay in the position of the present Scatari Island, off the easternmost point of Cape Breton. Confirmation for the theory thus established, that this point was Cabot's landfall, appeared to Dr. Dawson to be found on the only extant map of the fifteenth century which shows the American coast—the well-known *La Cosa* chart, of which an admirable half-size facsimile accompanies Dr. Dawson's latest paper. The theory that "the discovered cape" noted on this map represents Cape Breton, and that the adjacent English flags mark the southern coast of Newfoundland, seems to be somewhat more probable than are various other theories that it represents various other points on the North American coast. Another map, published before the middle of the sixteenth century, offers the clearest evidence in support of the Cape Breton landfall. This engraved map carries a statement that Sebastian Cabot made it in 1544, and it shows against Cape Breton a legend calling this the First Land Seen, which a marginal reference explains as meaning seen by John Cabot. This famous Cabot mappemonde, of which there is also an excellent large facsimile in the latest volume of the Royal Society of Canada, unfortunately raises more problems than it solves, and Dr. Dawson acted most wisely in establishing his case as best he could without its help.

In 1896, Dr. Dawson replied briefly to those who had expressed their inability to find conviction in his earlier essay, and now in his *Latest Phases* he has published an elaborate treatise upon those who continue to disagree with him. The value of his paper as an index to the spirit with which the controversy is being conducted in Canada, has been referred to already. Other excrement features of the argument are treated by Dr. Dawson's principal opponent, in another part of this REVIEW. Stated briefly, the landfall question as it now stands, is this: Residents of the United States having made no serious claim that the spot lay within their territory, we may assume that it must have been somewhere on the Canadian coast. As for the exact location, Dr. Dawson has presented a much stronger argument in favor of Cape Breton than has yet been made

for any other claimant. The important fact remains unchallenged, out of all this much-belabored controversy, that English sailors landed on North America in the early summer of 1497.

It is unfortunate that Dr. Dawson took the landfall as the dominating theme for his Cabot studies. His writings reveal a power of historical perception, a command of the conditions essential to the solving of historical problems, and a capacity for conscientious study, combined with some literary skill, which ought to have produced a most valuable account of the Cabots and their achievements. All the material for such an essay is set forth in his three monographs. Nowhere else can be found a more satisfactory statement of the various problems which make up the story of their English career. What still remains to be written is a clear, conservative, well-balanced, scholarly account of what is known and what may be surmised about the Cabots and the English discovery of America. Perhaps Mr. Beazley of Oxford might have written such an account. The conditions under which his contribution to Cabot literature appears to have been produced, however, made this impossible. The Cabot quadricentennial gave wide publicity to the following supposition: "that North America is now so largely occupied by an English-speaking population, with all their vast energies and accumulated wealth, has been largely owing to the daring genius of Cabot." At about the same time, somebody projected a series of biographies, of three hundred odd pages each, of "The Builders of Greater Britain." Of course, a life of Cabot was forthwith ordered. Very luckily, the task was entrusted to a most competent man, with the result that this book is quite the most sensible thing that has been published about the Cabots since the appearance of Mr. Charles Deane's essay in the *Narrative and Critical History of America*. The difference between the two is that Mr. Deane found seven pages amply sufficient for all that he had to say in the shape of a connected account of the Cabots, whereas Mr. Beazley has endeavored to fill 263 pages with a narrative of this same sort. As in other Cabot volumes, bulk is secured by introducing into the narrative the text of original documents, upon which all scholarly opinions on the subject must of course be based. Mr. Beazley's only fault is that he does not distinguish frankly between a serious critical study of these documents, and a popular narrative intended to interest and instruct the intelligent public of Greater Britain. The work, as he has done it, is thoroughly satisfactory. The translations which he prints are in nearly every case his own versions from the original texts, and, as already suggested, his comments and interpretations are conservative, careful, and sensible beyond precedent in recent Cabotian discussions.

Mr. G. E. Weare is an authority upon the antiquities of the English Bristol. Perhaps this is the reason why, when he published a book about Cabot, it aroused the prejudices of nearly every well-known student of the subject, with the result that it has failed to receive such honest critical notice as it may justly claim to deserve. Much of what has been said about this book, moreover, has been so manifestly unfair and untrue,

that a disinterested statement of one or two points is only the part of fair play. Mr. Weare's book is doubtless in many respects very bad. He filled up a volume about the Cabots; of necessity he appropriated a great deal of material from the works of other men, and in many cases he does not specify whence he copied. This practice, if one may judge from Mr. Beazley's book, does not seem to be regarded as a fault at the English universities. Mr. Weare printed the texts of documents which had been published elsewhere,—but where he could do so in London, he verified these texts, and in several cases his book contains a text more closely corresponding to the original manuscript than is elsewhere to be found in print. He also verified the translations which he copied, and both Dr. Dawson and, unwittingly, Mr. E. J. Payne have called attention to cases in which Mr. Weare has improved upon the versions of previous translators. Mr. Weare also published, for the first time, an interesting document recording the payment of John Cabot's pension, and he gave an exact reference to the place where the manuscript might be found. In another part of his book, he translated this document, and because he neglected to repeat the reference, some very harsh things have been said about him. In short, Mr. Weare's book is a useful repository of the Cabot documents, which may be consulted there, in their original languages and in English, more conveniently than anywhere else. Well-equipped students will continue to reply upon the more scholarly, and more expensive, volumes of HARRISSE and of MARKHAM, whenever they wish to examine these documents. They will also recognize with pleasure the efforts of every other student who succeeds in adding, however slightly, to the accuracy and the exhaustiveness of the work done by these masters of learning and of scholarship.

GEORGE PARKER WINSHIP.

*The First Republic in America*; an account of the Origin of this Nation, written from the records then (1624) concealed by the Council, rather than from the Histories then licensed by the Crown. By ALEXANDER BROWN, D.C.L. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co. 1898. Pp. xxiv, 688.)

THIS book may be considered as constituting the third volume of the *Genesis of the United States* by the same author, published in 1890. It utilizes the valuable documents arranged chronologically in that work, and other papers, some of which have been found by the author since its publication. Many of these documents have not been accessible to the public before Dr. Brown commenced the arduous task of search for them. The result of his labor has been an invaluable addition to our knowledge of the history of the Virginia Colony, the pioneer of English occupancy of North America. Not the least interesting part of Dr. Brown's work is the publication of the correspondence between the King of Spain and his minister at London, relative to the settlement at Jamestown, the minister urging the throttling of the infant colony, and the King anxious that it

be destroyed, yet taking no decisive step to that end, hoping that it would be abandoned because of the difficulties surrounding it. And well might Catholic Spain have exerted herself to prevent the English from obtaining a foothold in America, with their Protestant principles, civil and religious. English occupancy has proved to be Spanish exclusion; and the proud nation, once so rich and powerful, because of her American possessions, now, stripped of them, is so weak that there is little left to her beside her pride and her medieval ideas. No author has given so just an account of Spain's attitude towards the Virginia colony nor pictured with such minuteness the difficulties which attended its birth and infant growth. Through twenty years of its history the author has been able to trace the government of the colony under the original charter of 1606, and the subsequent charters of 1609 and 1612, and to relate the growth of the feeble settlement planted in 1607, into the self-sustaining community of 1624, when the King supplanted the authority of the Virginia Company of London, and took the government into his own hands. Now that the English dominate North America, every incident of this early history is of great interest, and the author has not omitted anything, however seemingly unimportant, which he considered authentic. He has thus taken 652 pages to relate the history of twenty years. It is safe to say that no library of American history can be considered complete without the publications of Dr. Brown, and no student of that history can afford to neglect their study.

With this estimate of the real worth of Dr. Brown's volumes, the reader will be pained to discover the deficiencies of an author, who has shown such commendable zeal in collecting and arranging original matter, but at the same time has shown himself wanting in some of the essential qualities of an historian. It has been well said of an historian, *nequid non veri audeat, nequid veri non audeat*. The great task for an historian therefore is the ascertainment of truth, which when once found he dare not conceal and be true to his calling. Where there have been parties to the transactions, making counter statements, the evidence on both sides must be weighed with judicial fairness. Dr. Brown states this more than once in his text, yet he has professedly written a history from *ex parte* testimony, entirely disregarding the statements of those members of the company, and colony, whose testimony has heretofore been accepted as true. He tells us on his title-page, that his book is "an account of the origin of this nation, written from the records then (1624) concealed by the council, rather than from the histories then licensed by the crown." He treats as false the histories of John Smith and the Rev. Samuel Purchas, published in 1624 and 1626, and the writings of the colonists on which they were based, and will have none of them. In fact he treats these authors, and those they followed, as enemies of the colony, though among them were men who ventured their money and lives in making it a success, and whose only difference with their colleagues, was as to the proper management of the enterprise. But Dr. Brown could not confine himself to the records of the Virginia Company,



concealed by the council at London, and write a history of the years previous to 1619, for we have scant account of these records previous to that date. He therefore uses the publications of the company, made from time to time, which he is forced to confess are not reliable, as their object was to encourage emigration to Virginia, and they therefore often conceal the miserable state of the colony. This concealment was in accordance with the policy declared in the instructions given to the first colonists sent in 1607, in these words, "Suffer no man to return but by passport from the President and Council, nor to write any letters of anything that may discourage others."

Again, Dr. Brown states that his object is to show that the colonization of Virginia was begun and conducted with the noble purposes of Christianizing the Indians, enlarging English commerce, and founding an English commonwealth in which should exist civil and religious liberty. He dwells often, and at great length, on the establishment of free institutions in the colony by the company, and he has named his book *The First Republic in America*. A proper study of the subject as shown even in this volume, leads us to the conclusion, that so far as the London Company were concerned these noble purposes, if ever generally entertained, soon resolved themselves into one, and that was the planting of a colony for the purpose of commerce, and that commerce to be monopolized by the company, even to the oppression of the colony. The author does not pretend that any great effort was made to Christianize the Indians, previous to the massacre of 1622, and after that treacherous act no mercy was shown them, and the whites, in modern phrase, considered that the only good Indians were dead Indians. As to religious liberty, we find no effort to relax the strict requirements of the established church in England, which were imposed upon the colony from the beginning, and toleration came long afterwards, and when it could not be longer withheld.

As to civil liberty, Dr. Brown has made a remarkable blunder, which is imbedded in the very name of his book. The colonists by their charters were guaranteed the civil rights of Englishmen, but they never in fact enjoyed them in full measure during the period of which Dr. Brown writes, and Virginia was not during any part of that time a republic. A republic is a state in which the supreme power is vested in representatives chosen by the people. This was never the condition of the colony of Virginia. During the existence of the Virginia Company of London, that company governed the colony, appointed its officers and gave it its laws. Even after the allowance of a representative legislative body in Virginia in 1619, the acts of that body were of no force until approved by the council in England, which still appointed the governor and council in Virginia, parts of the legislative body. The granting of that assembly was a great advance in the development of free institutions in Virginia, it is true, but it did not constitute Virginia a republic. Neither did the incorporation of the London Company in 1612, with power to govern the Virginia colony without interference from the Crown, except in matters touching the state, make the colony a republic. Indeed the govern-



ment of the colony by the London Company afterwards, was much more despotic than it had been under the first charter, when the company was controlled by the King; for then the council in Virginia had the privilege of choosing its own president, who was the governor. All this appears of necessity in Dr. Brown's book, for he could not entirely suppress the administrations of Gates, Dale, and Argall, nor the bitter complaints of the colonists, as shown even in papers issued by the assembly. We have to look further north for the first republic in America.

The key to Dr. Brown's serious mistakes in the very frame-work of his volume, is his bitter hostility to Captain John Smith, and his determination to brand as false every statement made by him, or in his praise, touching his conduct in Virginia. Of the twenty-three pages of his preface he devotes some twenty to violent abuse of Smith, and he never mentions him in the text without a flat contradiction, or an insinuation of dishonesty, or a sneer. Smith stated that the colony was better managed under the first charter than under the second and third, and he favored the renewal of the royal control which was effected in 1624. He was not singular in this. Many members of the company, and nearly all of the colonists, agreed with him, and the result justified them. But Dr. Brown, who fancies that the colony was a republic under the second and third charters, denounces Smith as an enemy of the colony, and is utterly unable to accord him any credit for his services in Virginia. These services have heretofore been held to have been valuable by historians, even by those who have discredited some of Smith's statements.

It would be easy, though tedious, to follow Dr. Brown in his frequent attacks upon Smith, and expose his injustice. But this must be reserved for another time. It need only be said here, that both Smith and Purchas wrote from ample contemporaneous authorities, existing before the differences arose in the London Company which caused its dissolution. And it may be added, that to have expected a company in London to continue to have the civil government over a colony in America growing into a state, would have been absurd in the extreme.

WM. WIRT HENRY.

*A Quaker Experiment in Government.* By ISAAC SHARPLESS, President of Haverford College. (Philadelphia: Alfred J. Ferris. 1898. Pp. 280.)

THE "Quaker Experiment" of which President Sharpless treats in this little volume—a monograph it must fairly be called—is that endeavor to establish civil government on ethical principles which William Penn, in his letter to James Harrison, August 25, 1681, termed "an Holy Experiment," and which he ardently hoped he might then find room for in America, though not in England. The experience of seventy-five years, from the summer of 1681, when Markham, provided with Penn's commission, reached the banks of the Delaware, and notified

the Duke of York's officials of the change of authority, down to the summer of 1756, when the followers of Penn withdrew under compulsion from further control of the colony—this experience it is upon which President Sharpless has written this intelligent and fair-minded essay. Its merits may not be appreciated, perhaps, for the book is in every way modest—in style, in dimensions, in print, even in binding—but it is a valuable piece of advice which we here present to those who care to be well informed concerning the colonial period in Pennsylvania, to get it, and read it through.

The plan of Penn and his associates, when they formed their government of Pennsylvania in 1682, was not merely democratic, but ethical, and on both accounts they raised up embittered enemies, who in the end prevailed against them. The fullness of power accorded the people, in the assembly, was always offensive in England, and even Thomas Penn—a son of the founder indeed, but much removed in temper and opinion—did not hesitate to say in 1760 (in a letter to Governor Hamilton), that he had “no disregard” for the Friends, *except* “on their leveling Republican system of government.” But it was on its ethical side that the Quaker experiment most invited attack. It proposed complete religious liberty. But that would give equal rights and opportunities to Jews and Papists! It proposed to deal fairly with the Indians. But that would starve out the land-grabbers and the dishonest traders. It proposed to be peaceable, and indulged the hope that thus peace would be maintained. But in such a system where was the place for the professional fighting man, or the opportunity for him to get “glory,” or acquire plunder and prizes? It proposed a simple and strictly administered government. But that would cut out sinecures, and soft and easy places for “younger sons.” Moreover, it proposed temperate and orderly living. What community could long tolerate that without rebellion? Because thou art virtuous, said Sir Toby Belch to Malvolio, dost thou think there shall be no more cakes and ale?

Under all the attacks which it thus invited, the Quaker experiment ultimately went down. We cannot say it failed; it was headed off. It did not come to an end; it was “side-tracked.” In its high ideal of 1682 it could not and did not permanently continue. The strict code of conduct, Puritanism refined, of the “Great Law” of 1682, was not long strictly enforced, though the social condition of the colony was always exceptionally temperate, orderly, and humane. The complete religious equality first accorded was impaired about the end of the century, under pressure from England, and tests excluding others than orthodox Protestants were exacted from members of the assembly and all civil officers.

But above all it was the peace policy of the Friends which most excited derision and anger. If the impression prevails amongst many English-speaking people, professing Christians, at the end of the nineteenth century, that fighting is normal, and the intervals of peace only periods of “preparation” for the next war, what could have been the common view at the end of the seventeenth? The realization by those who

watched them that Penn's colonists were actually endeavoring to avoid a military system and a war equipment, that they conceived there was really "no need for arsenals or forts," drew down upon them contempt from every quarter. Upon all the lines of argument which seemed reasonable to ordinary men, it could be demonstrated that such an experiment in government must fail. "Of all Friendly ideas," says President Sharpless, "the most difficult to incorporate practically into government machinery was that of peace," and this statement must be accepted with the fullest emphasis and significance that the language will bear. It *was* the most difficult; it is even now the most difficult, nearly a century and a half after the day the Friends surrendered their control of the Pennsylvania assembly.

The demand that the colony should arm itself, should "provide a militia," should furnish troops for the King's service, came with the English Revolution. The official news that James the Second was succeeded by William and Mary reached Philadelphia at the beginning of October, 1689, and the dispatch containing it stated also that His Majesty had ordered "all necessary preparation for a speedy war with the french king." Such orders the governor, that testy formalist, Captain John Blackwell, called on the assembly to respect, and the assembly, compelled to make an answer, then and later formulated the principles upon which the Friends endeavored to direct, and as a matter of fact, did direct, Pennsylvania's action in relation to such demands from the crown, down to their resignation of control in 1756. These principles were: (1) That the governor, being under the terms of Penn's charter captain of the military forces, was *ipso facto* empowered to organize troops, if he considered them necessary; (2) that there were available to him, for such purposes, those citizens who did not entertain the scruples of Friends concerning war; (3) that the assembly would vote money, to the extent which in their judgment the colony could afford "for the King's use." What that use might be His Majesty would decide. If he spent the money for war, he and not the assembly was accountable.

It cannot be said that this system did not answer fairly well for many years. The exigencies of Captain Blackwell's time were gotten over, Colonel Fletcher's arbitrary rule of two years was endured, the follies and futilities of young Governor Evans passed by, and then the treaties of Utrecht and the policy of Walpole gave the English colonies, with the mother country, a long breathing-spell of peace, and the unmilitary community on the Delaware prospered and grew. "Notwithstanding all difficulties and imperfections," says President Sharpless, justly, "there was for seventy years an efficient government in Pennsylvania, based largely on Penn's ideas. There were no wars or external troubles. The home affairs were quiet and orderly. Prosperity and contentment reigned, immigrants came in unprecedented numbers, and the public finances were so managed as to encourage trade, and lay no unnecessary burdens. Peace and justice were for two generations found available defenses for a successful state." The colony had, indeed, the service of able and intelli-

gent men. The speakers of the assembly, men like Joseph Growdon, Edward Shippen, David Lloyd, Andrew Hamilton, John Kinsey, and Isaac Norris, made a group of colonial statesmen inferior to none under the English flag in America, for the work assigned them. Their strength was fully equal to any local strain which the maintenance of an orderly government in their own province might have put upon them, however unequal it was to meet a three-fold attack from disaffected elements in their own population, from hostile critics in other colonies, and from the organizers of war in the mother country.

President Sharpless observes with truth that "no one can appreciate the history of Colonial Pennsylvania who does not understand the spirit, the methods, and the beliefs of the Society of Friends. The failure to grasp these firmly, the dependence upon public records exclusively for the materials of history, has been the cause of serious misjudgments." His own work is fair-minded and straightforward, and while he puts himself naturally and readily into the place of those who endeavored the Quaker commonwealth, he deals with his subject in a spirit of simple candor which the reader cannot but recognize and enjoy.

HOWARD M. JENKINS.

*American History told by Contemporaries.* Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Professor of History in Harvard University. Vol. II., Building of the Republic, 1689-1783. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. xxi, 653.)

PROBABLY the universal judgment would be that the period of Professor Hart's first volume is much richer in interesting materials of the sort which he is seeking to make known to students than that covered in the present volume. By comparison with the age of discovery and settlement and the days of Puritan enthusiasm, these ninety-four years, and especially the first seventy of them, were a dry time; the world was its own god, and Sir Robert Walpole was its prophet. Yet Professor Hart has attacked his new problem with so much force and enterprise and ingenuity that it is doubtful whether he has not made the second volume more interesting even than the first. The interest is of a different kind, to be sure. The editor has perceived that it must be so, that the period appeals to a different element in the student, young or old, that, while it is still possible to be entertaining, the emphasis must now be laid on political affairs and especially on the development of American institutions of government. More space might well have been given to the development of American economic life, considering its vital importance in a new country; but the growth of political institutions is certainly illustrated in a most varied and interesting manner. The skill with which this has been accomplished strikes the reader as perhaps the great success of the volume. The machinery of English control and the theories of Englishmen and provincials respecting it, the powers and duties of governors, the character and conduct of colonial assemblies and judicial

courts, the typical forms of local government in the various colonies, are all illustrated by extracts capitably chosen and arranged. This division of the book is preceded by one in which the leading events and phases in the public history of the individual colonies are exemplified by lively writings,—e. g., Salem witchcraft by portions of the testimony offered against the witches, the early days of Pennsylvania by Gabriel Thomas's account, the administrations of Andros and Nicholson in Virginia by Beverley's narrative thereof, and the founding of Georgia by half-a-dozen effective extracts. It is followed by a section devoted to the exhibiting of various aspects of colonial life, social, economic, intellectual and religious. In due proportion, more might have been made of the religious chapter. It seems a little meagre, and does not adequately exhibit normal conditions. Yet one would not have the ensuing chapter curtailed, in which a model series of excerpts illustrates slavery and servitude in the colonies. It is worth while to list them: the minute of the Germantown Quakers (1688), Sewall's *Selling of Joseph*, the text of the disallowance of a slave act (though here an act hindering importations, and its disallowance, would have been better), a series of advertisements of runaways, an extract from Woolman's *Journal*, Eddis on white servants, and Washington on importing Palatines. Part V. is concerned with intercolonial wars, Part VI. deals, very abundantly, with the causes of the Revolution, Part VII. with the characteristics of the patriot and loyalist parties and of the British and American forces. The various political, diplomatic and military aspects of the Revolution are illustrated with great skill, though we should think there might have been a few more good accounts of battles. Also, for the general period, we should think more space should have been given to the West.

Space for such purposes might have been saved from the "Practical Introduction." It is excellent and most helpful, but it is a repetition, with only the illustrations changed, of the introduction to the first volume. Apparently it is thought that there will be a considerable separate use of the individual volumes (there are to be four). We do not think so. Most courses in American history, given either in school or in college, are continuous courses in the whole history of the United States; and not many will employ these useful and vivifying volumes for one period without wishing to use them for all.

Two small criticisms of detail may be added. First, the head-notes to the extracts might often be made a few words longer, to the profit of the student. He will often need a little more explanation. Thus, most of No. 79 refers to Braintree, though it appears to relate to Boston. If a letter is given, it should be stated to whom it is addressed. Secondly, it is a pity to print "y" for "the," if only because it will lead American youth to perpetuate the unfortunate habit of most of their elders, in pronouncing the word so printed as if it were the plural of "you," and supposing that our ancestors used to print it so.



*The Writings of James Monroe*, including a Collection of his Public and Private Papers and Correspondence now for the first time printed. Edited by STANISLAUS MURRAY HAMILTON. Vol. I., 1778-1794. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1898. Pp. lxxv, 400.)

DOWN to the time when, at the age of forty-five, Monroe went to Paris to negotiate for New Orleans, he kept no letter-books and preserved copies of but few of his letters. The Monroe Papers in the possession of the Department of State include but a score of his letters anterior to 1800, and these are mostly of the period of his first mission to France. The present volume, a welcome addition to the handsome series of the "Writings of the Fathers," extends only to his departure upon that earlier mission. Accordingly the editor, an accomplished and painstaking official of the Bureau of Rolls and Library, has drawn from the Monroe Papers but two of the letters in the volume, and one of those, the long and important letter of August 12, 1786, to Patrick Henry, was presented to the Department by Mr. William Wirt Henry and has been printed in his life of his grandfather (II. 291). Mr. Hamilton has drawn his material almost wholly from the rich stores of the Jefferson and Madison Papers, also possessed by the Department. Out of 131 letters printed, 73 are letters to Jefferson (all but one of them from this source), and 47 are letters to Madison derived from the government's Madison Papers. Only ten, perhaps only nine, are derived from other sources than the manuscripts of the Department, and of these at least six have already been printed,<sup>1</sup> though the fact is not mentioned in any case save one.

Mr. Hamilton has placed historical scholars under obligations of such magnitude by his volume, and has, moreover, for so many years obliged with unfailing helpfulness all those who have had occasion to use the treasures from which the volume is drawn, that it seems ungracious to pause at this point and find fault. Yet two criticisms are inevitable, and fortunately they are of such a sort that they can without serious difficulty be met in the subsequent volumes of the series. In the first place, the source whence each letter is derived ought without fail to be indicated. This should surely be regarded as a fundamental rule in all editing of correspondence. If the letter has been printed before, the reader is entitled to know it. In the second place, a larger range of sources should be drawn upon. It is quite true that, down to 1803 at any rate, Monroe's letters to Jefferson and Madison are of much more consequence than any others. An industrious and sensible public functionary, neither brilliant nor original, he was their pupil (especially Jefferson's), leaned on them, sought their advice, and kept in constant touch with them.

<sup>1</sup> To Charles Lee, June 15, 1780, *Lee Papers*, III. 427; to Washington, August 15, 1782, *Correspondence of the Revolution*, III. 527; to R. H. Lee, December 16, 1783, May 24, 1786, *Lee's Lee*, II. 221, 224; to Governor Harrison, October 30, 1784, *William and Mary College Quarterly*; to Washington, April 8, 1794, *Sparks*, X. 557.



His letters to them from Congress, during the years 1784, 1785 and 1786, are on the whole the most valuable part of the collection. But there are not a few other existing letters, which have a considerable interest. Mr. Hamilton does not exclude from his scheme letters that have already been printed, and this is wholly proper, since so few of Monroe's letters have found their way into print. Now the letter of September 10, 1782, to Lord Stirling, printed in Duer's *Stirling*, p. 250; that of April 4, 1783, to Richard Henry Lee, printed in Lee's *R. H. Lee*, II. 225; that of February, 1784, to George Mason, in Miss Rowland's *Mason*, II. 68; that of April 20, 1786, to Jay, in Jay's *Correspondence*, III. 190; those of December, 1790, from Senator Monroe to the Governor of Virginia, in the *Virginia Calendars*, V. 229, 231, 414; and that of April 7, 1792, to Henry Lee, printed in the appendix to the latter's *Campaign of 1781*, p. xlvii, are all of interest, not to say of greater interest than some of the letters to Jefferson and to Madison. Of these last Mr. Hamilton has omitted almost none. He prints all but three or four of those possessed by the Department, a practice to which we should think he could hardly adhere in later volumes.

Of manuscript letters, too, there must be more in existence. The catalogue of the McGuire sale mentions twenty-eight, some of which fall within the period before 1794. The George Clinton papers at Albany contain many Monroe letters. The archives of the state of Virginia formerly contained a number of Monroe's letters from the Continental Congress to the governor of the state, one of which, at least, dealing partly with the Vermont controversy (1784), was of much interest and value. If the others have been lost, there is a copy of this among the Sparks Papers. In particular, it would have been gratifying if more letters of 1787 and 1788 could have been got together, from the treasures of autograph-hunters or otherwise.

But the volume as it stands is a most valuable possession, and a signal addition to our means of understanding the times to which it relates. It will be a long time before scholars will have exhausted all that can be derived from it. The editor has done his own work with conscientious care. The notes, which are not numerous, are well executed. The cipher passages in the letters ought all to have been deciphered. There is a table of contents, of the same clear and satisfying construction which has been used in the earlier issues of the series. A very well-conceived addition is that of "Annals of the Life of Monroe," which extend to some fifty pages, embracing not only biographical annals, but the substance, and often the text, of motions made by Monroe in deliberative bodies and of reports made by committees of which he was a member.

We cannot close without adverting to the light which the full publication of Monroe's letters of the years 1784-1788, to Jefferson and Madison, casts upon George Bancroft's literary methods. He makes use of nearly two-thirds of those letters in the appendixes to his *Formation and Adoption of the Constitution*, printing parts or, in a few cases, the whole letter. But they are almost always garbled. Garbled in the original

sense of the word, to be sure, not in its modern and worse sense. There is no evidence of intention to deceive; but the text presented is a mosaic of sentences or passages picked out and run together, with no indication of omission. The result is sometimes misleading. For instance, Mr. Bancroft's process gives us, in one letter (I. 363) the following: "For four or five days past the qualification of the delegates from Rhode Island hath been the only subject before us. The question was, Shall a delegation retain its seat, or any particular member, the term of service having actually expired? The gentlemen wait for me." What Monroe really wrote was this (Hamilton, I. 27): "For four or 5 days past the qualification of the Delegates from R. I. hath been the only subject before us. The motion respecting them was from Mr. Read. This brought forward the report of the committee, which was against them and conformable to the principles established in the case of Delanson. Upon the question shall the resolution stand? 4 States voted in the affirmative, 2 in the negative and 3 were divided. Of course it was enter'd in the journals that it was lost. The question then was, are they under this vote delegates? On the side of those in the negative the arguments are: if 7 states were on the floor represented generally by but two members and the question was, shall a delegation retain its seat, or any particular member, the time of service having actually expir'd, the vote of one member only would keep him in Congress. 2. that," etc. This is quite a little different. Judging from internal evidence only, it is plain that Mr. Bancroft's text is in other respects considerably less correct than that of Mr. Hamilton (though "giving our own citizens a show," p. 87, is surely too modern; Mr. Bancroft has "share").

The later volumes, dealing with transactions in which Monroe was more nearly the central figure, will be awaited with impatience. Some of them will lead us down into a field which sorely needs more abundant illustration. For the years after 1815 we have, to be sure, a good number of letters of Adams, Jefferson and Madison; but they had now become spectators of the drama. We shall not see with clearness the faces and motions of the actors till we have editions of the correspondence of Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Calhoun, Jackson, Van Buren, Clinton, Tompkins, Crawford (if it be possible), and fuller sets of Clay and Webster. Mr. Hamilton has broken ground most acceptably in a great field.

*The Federalist: A Commentary on the Constitution of the United States*, by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay. Edited, with notes, illustrative documents, and a copious index by PAUL LEICESTER FORD. (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1898. Pp. lxxvii, 793.)

In the preparation of this volume, Mr. Ford has had in view two distinct objects, a convenient working edition of *The Federalist* and a manual for the study of the history of the constitution of the United States. These objects are sufficiently dissimilar to render their combina-

tion difficult, and the results, in the present instance, are of unequal value. The main part of the work, *The Federalist*, is, in several respects, a marked advance on all preceding editions. The rest of the volume is taken up with a very perfunctory collection of constitutional documents relating to the history of the United States since 1789. These twenty-five documents are simply arranged in chronological order without any critical apparatus whatever. It is probable that Mr. Ford's book was already in the press when Professor MacDonald's collection was published. Before the appearance of the latter, Mr. Ford's collection, imperfectly prepared as it is for purposes of systematic instruction, would have been welcome. Now, one can but lament that he did not devote the space to reprinting in a more accessible form selections from his *Essays and Pamphlets on the Constitution*. By so doing Scott has given his edition of *The Federalist*, in other respects less desirable than Lodge's, Dawson's, or Hamilton's, and far inferior to Mr. Ford's, a distinct value. For the new index every student of *The Federalist* must be grateful. It is hardly too much to say that it alone will make this edition indispensable. The running titles, the marginal cross-references to parallel passages, and the new table of contents will also be very helpful.

Mr. Ford's commentary is always interesting and will prove stimulating and instructive to students of our government as it is. I regret to say that, judged by a reasonable standard of historical accuracy, it is in need of careful revision. Freeman once said: "The accurate man is not a man who makes no mistakes, but a man who corrects his own mistakes in the proof-sheets." This Mr. Ford has not taken sufficient pains to do. He writes from the exceptionally large stores of his knowledge of American history with the easy confidence of a brilliant talker who is a master of his subject. Some of the errors in the notes arise from haste, others seem unaccountable on any ground except off-hand reliance upon a memory more fallible than its owner suspects, while still others are perhaps more justly characterized as paradoxes or vagaries of judgment. If Mr. Ford had taken the scholarly precaution to give the reader some precise references for the historical matter in the notes he must needs have discovered some of these errors himself. A few examples will illustrate these points. On p. 458 is this note: "According to Mr. Bryce, the last instance 'of the use of the veto power in England was by Queen Anne in 1707 on a Scotch mill bill.' In Tod's *Parliamentary Government in the English Colonies* (ii. p. 319) the author says that in 1858 changes in a private railway bill were compelled by an intimation to its promoters that, if these changes were not made, the royal power of rejection would be exercised." For "mill" read "militia," and for Tod, read Todd. This last misprint as well as the whole sentence is taken bodily from Bryce. It is, however, entirely irrelevant, as it relates to a crown veto of colonial legislation. P. 425, "In Bagehot's *English Constitution* he discusses at some length the question of the time at which the House of Lords 'must yield' to the Commons, and reaches the singularly stultifying conclusion to his main argument that it is 'when-

ever the opinion of the Commons is also the opinion of the nation.''' As no hint is given of what Bagehot's main argument was, nine readers out of ten will surely conclude that Mr. Ford regards Bagehot's dictum, as quoted, as absurd, whereas it is to-day the established conservative view of the position of the Lords. Lord Salisbury has justified the existence of the Lords on the ground that they can save the country from radical revolutionary legislation till it becomes certain by a general election that the will of the country is known, when it is their duty to yield. On p. 329 Mr. Ford writes: "The early Congresses of the Union assumed the right to nominate the President, and for thirty years forced upon the people candidates for President." Who could get from this note any correct notion of the nomination by party caucus? P. 211: "During the Civil War most of the northern states incurred 'war debts,' that of New York alone being in excess of twenty-seven million dollars. But this latter was so greatly out of proportion to the debts of the other states that recently the larger part was refunded by the national government." To what does this refer? I can but conjecture that Mr. Ford had in mind the refunding of the direct tax of 1861. If I am wrong, the stricture still holds good that such a note should be more explicit or should refer the reader to a source of further information. On p. 142 in discussing deadlocks between the houses of Congress, he says that they have "compelled the introduction of a new legislative element in the shape of a third or union chamber, usually termed a compromise committee." The proper term is "committee of conference," although the more familiar name is simply "conference committee." I should be glad for a reference for this statement on p. 70, "Warm as the national feeling has been toward France, we aided St. Domingo to obtain its freedom by every possible if surreptitious device." Our feeling was not warm toward France, except in irritation, during most of the disturbances in St. Domingo; yet, when this irritation was keen during the power of the Directory, Secretary Pickering was careful to prevent the government from being implicated in any violation of neutrality. (Cf. *Am. Hist. Assoc. Rep.*, 1896, pp. 825-827.) On the next page (71) Cornelius de Pauw's fanciful "*Recherches Philosophiques sur les Américains*" are credited to Raynal.

On p. 520 we read that "Jefferson, with more extreme action, holding the alien and sedition acts to be unconstitutional, actually refused to consider them as laws." This refers to action by Jefferson as president, but it is perfectly well known to everybody that these acts expired by limitation before Jefferson became president. Later on in the same note we read "Jackson is quoted as saying that he intended to support the constitution as he 'understood it.'" Why not quote Jackson himself rather than some unnamed source? In his Bank veto message Jackson wrote: "Each public officer who takes an oath to support the constitution, swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others." In the review of the history of attempted nullifications on p. 101 there is no mention of the Personal Liberty laws which

are among the best examples; on the other hand mistaken importance is assigned to the fact that in California during the war greenbacks did not circulate. This was not nullification in any sense. Mr. Ford attributes the failure of the greenback to circulate in California to the force of public opinion. Add to this the fact that California was a remote and detached community and a large producer of gold. Nullification is the attempt of the constituted authorities of a state to abolish within its boundaries a federal law on the ground that it is unconstitutional. For over half a century after the establishment of our coinage system nearly all the silver coin in actual circulation was Spanish or Mexican. That fact, however, is not to be mentioned in a history of nullification. The following comment on p. xxv is incomprehensible: "The only serious endeavor to break up the country which has ever occurred was in a section where those who should have been the controlling citizens were chiefly slaves, unable to make their influence a power." As one reads the notes it soon appears that inheritance and income taxes are a genuine bug-a-boo to Mr. Ford. His dogmatic deliverances on these intricate questions give no evidence of any impartial study of these matters. To him they are simply devices to shift the burdens of government unfairly on to a minority.

In his general comments on political tendencies Mr. Ford is often very suggestive. Take, for example, his brief supplement to Mr. Bryce's chapter, "Why the best men do not go into politics." In substance, it is that the increase in the facilities of communication between constituents and representatives has made the representative far less independent in action and far less important than was formerly the case. He is gradually but inevitably being depressed into a mere delegate. This condition is repellent to men of masterful character and pre-eminent ability.

There is much that is interesting and highly instructive in the first part of the Introduction, which takes up the political conditions following the Revolution. In regard to the discussion of the authorship of the disputed numbers it is not necessary for me to take up more than one or two points, for Mr. Ford has reprinted without change the article which he contributed to the REVIEW in July, 1897. It would be futile to repeat the criticisms that I then offered, for they made no impression on Mr. Ford. It will not be presumptuous to say that some of his assertions were proved absolutely to be mistaken and that the basis of others was seriously undermined. Yet he makes no corrections or defence. This is, of course, discouraging to a critic, and misleading to the public. It cannot fail to impair one's confidence in Mr. Ford's readiness to weigh evidence contrary to his previous conclusions.

He still ascribes Numbers 18, 19 and 20 to Hamilton and Madison, although his notes make it clear that Madison wrote them. He is still positive that the document commonly called Hamilton's "Brief of Argument on the Constitution" is a syllabus of *The Federalist* drawn up by Hamilton for Madison's guidance in continuing the papers when Hamil-



ton stopped with Number 36, published January 8, 1788. Against this assumption, I showed "that some of the heads of this syllabus reproduce the topics of some of Hamilton's earlier numbers" (*c. g.*, 9, 22, 23). He would hardly expect Madison to go over that ground again, while it would be natural enough to use it again himself in the New York convention. In addition to this I will now call attention to the fact that this syllabus reproduces in skeleton form an argument elaborated in one of the earliest Madison papers, No. 14, published November 30. Toward the end of the syllabus we find these apparently meaningless figures under the caption

"Exaggerated ideas of extent:"

"N.	45	42	
S.	31	31	
	14	11	438
	973	764½	mean 868¾ by
			750"

What could Madison make out of that memorandum unaided? Turning, however, to Number 14, p. 84, the significance is clear. The whole number is devoted to confuting Montesquieu's notion that republican government was suited only to small territories. One of several arguments urged against its application to the Union is that the Union is not really so large after all. "The limits as fixed by the treaty of peace, are: on the east, the Atlantic, on the south the latitude of 31 degrees, on the west the Mississippi, and on the north an irregular line, running in some instances beyond the 45th degree, in others, falling as low as the 42d. Computing the distance between the 31st and 45th degrees, it amounts to 973 common miles; computing it from 31 to 42 degrees, to 764½ miles. Taking the mean of the distance, the amount 868¾. The mean distance from the Atlantic to the Mississippi does not probably exceed 750 miles," etc. The same argument and additional points that I have omitted will also be found in the memorandum which Madison drew up for use in the Virginia convention. The natural and unbiassed conclusion is that this statistical argument was originally drawn up by Madison and that it was so effectively used by him in Number 14 that Hamilton in preparing himself for the New York convention jotted down a brief memorandum of the figures for the dimensions of the country. This was perfectly legitimate. It is by no means necessary to prove or to assume that every argument in *The Federalist* originated with Hamilton. There are no difficulties in believing that this document is what John C. Hamilton and Lodge called it, "Brief of Argument," etc. There are insuperable difficulties in believing it to be what Mr. Ford says it was: a syllabus drawn up by Hamilton in January, 1788, to guide Madison in expounding the details of a government that Hamilton did not believe in and of which Madison, more than anyone else, was the framer.

EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE.



*The Proposed Amendments of the Constitution of the United States during the First Century of its History.* By HERMAN V. AMES, Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania. [Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the year 1896, Vol. II.] (Washington: Government Printing Office. 1897 [1898]. Pp. 442.)

THIS essay won the prize awarded by the American Historical Association for the best monograph based upon original investigation in history, submitted to the Council in 1896. It is a work of great value and interest to all students of American history, and no investigator into the development of our Constitution or the growth of our political institutions can afford to overlook it. The production of the monograph proves the wisdom of the Association in offering the prize, which we hope will result in a series of similar researches, even if they do not reach the excellence of this essay by Professor Ames. Scholars of constitutional history have long felt indebted to Professor Albert Bushnell Hart for the investigations into the journals and documents of Congress pursued in his seminary at Harvard. And this, the author of which gracefully acknowledges the aid of Professor Hart, is of the same character although superior to the rest.

The book begins with a brief historical summary of the amendments proposed. They are then described in detail, classified in accordance with their respective subjects, accompanied by an account of the circumstances which suggested them. This, the principal part of the essay, displays wide learning as well as microscopic research, and is a magazine of curious facts, many of which are little known, that will be invaluable to any future historian. The conclusion is a chronological list of all the officially proposed amendments that Professor Ames has found, some of which were not published in the Journals but have been copied by him from the archives of the Senate and of the state legislatures. The catalogue contains more than 1740 propositions, from which have resulted the fifteen that have been adopted. The inaction of the lower house of the legislature of South Carolina in 1811 alone prevented the ratification of a sixteenth amendment, which would have been the thirteenth in consecutive order, providing that the acceptance of a title of nobility or honor should be a forfeiture of citizenship of the United States and a disqualification for office "under them or either of them." This passed Congress against but eight dissenting votes, was ratified by the legislatures of twelve states—in Pennsylvania unanimously,—and by the Senate of South Carolina; and the belief that it had become a part of the Constitution was so widely entertained that it was printed as adopted in official publications until 1817 and in school histories as late as 1836 (pp. 187-189).

The results from this and other searches in the Journals of Congress should lead to a new field for the investigators of the original sources of our constitutional and institutional history, who are now working in the

universities. The journals of the state legislatures form an almost uncultivated province which will yield rich results to the patient explorer. His labors there will be rewarded not only by the discovery of the sources of many of the most important provisions of state constitutions that have been copied throughout the country and of statutes that have been copied throughout the world, the history of which is still unwritten; but also by unearthing precedents in conflicts between the three departments, the executive, the legislative and the judiciary, between the two houses of a legislature and between one house and a minority of its members, which will be of great value to statesmen in future crises of our national history.

If the prizes offered by the American Historical Association will encourage studies in this direction, all scholars whose vocations deprive them of the pleasure of such original research will be as grateful to these students as they are now to Professor Ames.

ROGER FOSTER.

*The Journal of Jacob Fowler*, narrating an Adventure from Arkansas through the Indian Territory, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, and New Mexico, to the Sources of Rio Grande del Norte, 1821-22. Edited with notes by ELLIOTT COUES. (New York: Francis P. Harper. 1898. Pp. xxiv, 183.)

"I LOVE ballads in print for then we know they are true." This knowledge of Mopsa's we all have in reading Fowler's *Journal*. We feel it to be as true as print or preaching. Lying is not easy when one writes to aid his own memory.

Jacob Fowler made a land journey of thirteen months from Covington, Ky., to Taos and back again. His narrative begins with his departure from Fort Smith, Ark., September 6, 1821. He was second in command in a horseback party of traders and trappers twenty strong. Their route was along a branch of the Arkansas reaching that river near the southern line of Kansas. They made the earliest recorded march up that stream to the site of the modern Pueblo. Thence five of the company crossed the mountains to Santa Fe. Their absence was alarmingly long, but after four weeks they returned with permission to trap and trade in the Spanish provinces. Accordingly they followed the Taos trail, and arrived in Taos after ten days of mountain march. Thence five of them pushed on up the Rio Grande not only to the site of Pike's block-house where he was captured by Spaniards, but within one day's travel of the reported head of that river. The return homeward was partly down the Arkansas, and then over to the Missouri near Kansas City.

The memoranda jotted down from day to day by Major Fowler relate to a world in much of which he was the earliest explorer. They ought to have been published long ago. His experience as a land-surveyor doubled the value of his observations. Streams, their beds and water, water-powers, springs, trees, lime, coal, hills, prairies, animals, nothing escaped him. Multitudes in Kansas and Colorado will greet his book with a double welcome. Thanks to the illuminating topography of Dr.

Coues they will recognize the earliest mention of characteristic features in their local habitations. Fowler's cabin on the spot where Pueblo stands was the first house built there. After leaving the shadow of his starting-point he discovered no house during the five months' pilgrimage to Taos. His band carried no provisions except salt. Beans and corn were bought of some squaws, but most of the game had been scared away by Indians who would daily kill a hundred buffalo—eating little of them but the tongues. The Indians if hostile were robbers, and if friendly were worse, as thieves. Spaniards were more feared than natives. Neither proved worth trading with. Trapping was also a failure. Buffalo skins were too heavy in the pre-wheel era, while of beaver, the fur most coveted, the catch never equalled the days. One of the adventurers was killed by a bear. Horses were so often stolen that much of the day must be spent in securing them for the night, in pens four logs high with no entrance save through the door of the travellers' tent. They needed such a safeguard, even when near friendly Indians who had come home with two hundred newly-stolen horses. Their thievish skill was a match for Gines Passamont's stealing Sancho's mule while its owner was sleeping in the saddle.

Fowler's record is of laconic terseness, but it shows him as resourceful as Robinson Crusoe, and draws the reader along in wonder what will come next. His idioms cannot be forgotten. The cañon was "bound in on each side with a rock a squirrel could not climb." "No more rain than would wet a man's shirt. Wind so cold we scarce dared to look around." "Nothing to eat. We look at each other with hungry faces. Whites grew black in the face, and Paul(a negro) was getting white with the same complaint."

Odd incidents are the green hide of a buffalo used as a boat, and Spaniards painted like Indians. But the oddest of all also showed an aboriginal sense of humor. Fowler having broken one of the glasses in his spectacles, an Indian ran off with them, and Fowler's cry "stop thief" was answered by a universal laugh from the tribe around. The thief had fitted the spectacles on an Indian who had but one eye. The shout was, one glass, one eye. Fowler's own surprise, however, was greatest at a boiling spring spouting up and forming a pond of hot water "where the ice extended some feet from the shore." He was amazed that "ice could exist on hot water, caught hold of the ice and was not only scalded with the water, but was burned with the ice it being nearly as hot. It was a mineral that had congealed."

Fowler might have become an Indian monarch. He played a good bluff game in word and deed against threatening foes. By ransoming a Spaniard from Indian captivity he made that nation friendly. Thanks to medals and other trinkets he stole the hearts of aboriginals so fully that they refused to sell him horses and stole those he brought with him in order to keep him among them. In the multitude of foes he found safety, for each tribe defended him from some other, and his Calibans were less treacherous than Prospero found his.

JAMES D. BUTLER.

*The Monroe Doctrine.* By W. F. REDDAWAY, B.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1898. Pp. vii, 162.)

FROM the historical standpoint this is the most valuable contribution to the literature of the Monroe Doctrine which has yet appeared. With due deference to the philosophy of history the author states in the opening chapter, entitled "The Postulates of the Monroe Doctrine," the events beginning with the peace of 1763 after the termination of the Seven Years' War, which led to the Declaration of 1823, while most writers upon the subject treat the Declaration as a naked proposition with little reference to a cause. Mr. Reddaway is a scholar of keen discernment and thorough in investigation. He exhibits a knowledge of American history very creditable to a foreigner and he shows a discriminating judgment and great accuracy of analysis in the presentation of the instances in which the Doctrine has been applied or invoked.

The following passage from the preface is a succinct statement of the author's views: "Nothing newly published has seemed to the author to render necessary any modification of the main conclusions of the essay:—that the evolution of the Monroe Doctrine was gradual; that the peculiar form of the Message of 1823 was due to John Quincy Adams; that he, and he alone, logically applied it in politics; and that it produced its desired effect as an act of policy, but in no way modified the Law of Nations. The recent policy of the United States towards both Cuba and Hawaii appears to add strength to the argument of the last chapter—that since 1829 appeals to the Doctrine have been regulated by neither the nature nor the limits of the original."

By the student of American history the portrayal on pages 30-34 of the respective characteristics of President Monroe and John Quincy Adams, his Secretary of State, must be regarded not merely as a striking picture but as the very perfection of antithesis.

In the chapter which treats of the occupation of Mexico by the French during our Civil War are these words, particularly significant at the present time: "Every power, as a member of the international police, has the right to interfere in behalf of any nation which it may deem to be oppressed."

While it is to be regretted that by some oversight a table of contents is omitted, and while the book is perhaps too profound for the casual reader, it will doubtless be regarded as a classic by those who take more than a passing interest in the subject.

GEORGE FOX TUCKER.

*The Liberty and Free Soil Parties in the Northwest.* By THEODORE CLARKE SMITH, Ph.D. [Harvard Historical Series, VI.] (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1897. Pp. xi, 351.)

THE history of the Liberty and Free Soil parties of the Northwest by Theodore Clarke Smith is a timely and valuable contribution to our po-

litical annals. The title of the book might well have been "the genesis of the Republican party," for it sets forth clearly the causes which found their natural outcome in the grand movement that rallied under Fremont in 1856, and triumphed under Lincoln in 1860. The repeal of the Missouri Compromise played an important part in rousing the people and speeding the march of events, but it was merely an incident, as Mr. Smith shows, of the concerted measures which had already been set on foot for the formation of a consolidated national anti-slavery party that was to supersede all previous organizations. In the light of these facts, it seems surprising that the beginnings of anti-slavery politics in the Northwest have hitherto been unexplored. The work has probably been slighted as belonging to the field of local history; but the principle of hostility to slavery was not local. It touched the national life, as history testifies, and the men of the Northwest were helping to lay the foundations of a world-famous movement. What they did is worthy of historical record, and the record is now made.

The writing of such a history called for patient industry and tireless labor. It involved much travel through the Northwestern states; correspondence with anti-slavery pioneers and their descendants, and personal intercourse with them; the search for important facts in many public libraries; the thorough overhauling of the files of many old newspapers; and the orderly combination of the material thus gathered into an adequate and faithful account of an important historic movement. All this work is well done. Mr. Smith writes in sympathy with his subject. He seems, indeed, to have entered into the spirit of his task as if he had been himself a party to the strifes and struggles he describes; and yet his judicial temper is never found wanting. He deals fairly and even kindly with the old parties. He frankly takes note of the mistakes and short-sightedness of the Free Soil leaders touching their coalitions with Whigs and Democrats; and he criticises both Liberty party men and Free Soilers for their faults of temper and harshness of speech in dealing with their opponents. But he recognizes their courage and zeal in standing by a great cause in the day of its weakness and in the face of insurmountable obstacles. "For a young voter," says Mr. Smith, "or a young aspirant for political honors to cast in his lot with the third party was at almost any time and in almost every state an act of heroic self-abnegation. As we read of committees and nominations, and tickets and campaigns, we forget that nearly all of these meetings and urgent appeals were the laughing-stock of both the regular organizations; that the Liberty leaders, and nearly all of the Free Soil leaders, were cut off from any hope of election to any office in the gift of the people. Mistakes and miscalculations and intemperance of language were effaced by the magnificent purpose to arouse the nation to a consciousness of its own guilt and danger from slavery." The history of such a party is a fascination. We read it in the illumination of great historic facts which owe their lineage to the courage, constancy and self-forgetfulness of men who made themselves of no reputation in the service of the truth. Through a



series of years and in spite of overwhelming numbers and the greatest discouragements they prosecuted their purpose "with a step as steady as time." They were confronted by personal abuse, political proscription, and sometimes by mob violence; but they resolutely maintained their ground. Slowly, and little by little, they saw their cause advancing, never doubting its final triumph; and, at last, when the madness of slavery struck down the Missouri Compromise and flooded the country with anti-slavery recruits, they willingly disbanded the little parties in which they had so long labored, and joyfully took their places in the grand national movement which followed. All this is set forth in detail in Mr. Smith's chapters, and we hope they are to be followed by a like history of the Liberty and Free Soil parties of New England and the Middle States, and a final volume dealing with the formation of the national Republican party and its great work.

Mr. Smith confines himself exclusively to the question of political action against slavery. This is the novel feature of his work, but we think it adds to its timeliness and value. It touches a question about which there has been much controversy and some confusion of thought, and the truth ought to be told. That class of anti-slavery men who regarded the Federal Constitution as "a covenant with death," and whose consciences constrained them to abjure the use of the ballot, were obliged to do their work outside of politics. Their agitation was moral, and so far as it strengthened anti-slavery opinion it re-enforced the work of legislation; but anti-slavery opinion could not enforce itself. It needed some working theory giving assurance of results. The attempt to overthrow slavery without political action under a government carried on by the ballot was simply preposterous, while the dissolution of the Union would leave the slave in his chains. Nor could any citizen escape complicity with slavery by declining to vote. Total expatriation was necessary, and this was neither enjoined nor practised. We honor the great moral leaders whose unquestioned courage and devotion to humanity have done so much to efface their mistakes of judgment, and whose labors have been so abundantly recounted in our anti-slavery literature since the close of the Civil War; but the abolition of slavery was accomplished in spite of their theories, and by methods which they unsparingly condemned. History will so make the record, and we think the work so well begun by Mr. Smith may be accepted as an earnest of this consummation.

One of the most attractive features of this volume is its character-sketching. In the admirable account of the famous coalition in the Ohio legislature of 1848, by which the Free Soilers secured a United States senator, the reader will find better photographs of Salmon P. Chase and Joshua R. Giddings than he has ever seen before. Each of these famous men is made to stand forth in the lights and shadows of his character in his true attitude and real lineaments. A similar observation would apply, though in a less degree, to James G. Birney, as sketched in other parts of the volume. Mr. Smith's estimate of Samuel Lewis, of Ohio, is strikingly true, and it will gladden the heart of every surviving



friend of this most unselfish and unsullied anti-slavery hero; while he makes honorable mention of many inconspicuous but faithful laborers in the great cause whose right to historic recognition is properly asserted. The great leaders are duly honored; but so are the minor celebrities who gave their whole hearts to the work in counties and townships, including many editors of local newspapers who spent their little fortunes in the effort to propagate their principles. Without the labors of these men the great cause would have made little headway, and they should be honored as brave and faithful pioneers who opened the way for the armies that were to follow.

We think Mr. Smith's general fairness in dealing with the Anti-Nebraska movement in his nineteenth chapter needs a little qualification in his reference to Indiana on pp. 290 and 291. His tone seems rather too apologetic. The movement of 1854 was captured by Know Nothings and Silver Gray Whigs who completely subordinated the slavery issue to their longing for immediate success. There was a strong and growing anti-slavery feeling among the masses, but it was smothered by the mercenaries who managed the campaign. It ended in an overwhelming victory in which nothing was decided. The same game was played the following year and with like results, while even in 1856 a similar "combination of weaknesses" insulted political decency. In the state "fusion" convention of this year the name Republican was for the third time disowned, and Fillmore Knownothingism was recognized in the formation of the state ticket and the selection of presidential electors. Clay, Burlingame and other distinguished leaders of the Republican cause were not allowed to take the stump in the country south of the National Road where such speeches were imperatively needed, and the new movement was frequently defended as the "white man's party." Such facts should not be slighted, because they belong to the history of the Anti-Nebraska struggle, and show how fearful must have been the task of anti-slavery regeneration in that state.

A few slight inaccuracies may be cited. On page 6, Rev. W. H. Brisbane is mentioned as a native of North Carolina. It should be South Carolina. On p. 61, S. C. Stevens is referred to as residing in Madison County. His residence was the town of Madison, in Jefferson County. On the same page, "E. Deming, a lawyer," should read "E. Deming, a physician." On p. 130, Mayor J. B. Seamans is mentioned as presiding over a state convention at Indianapolis in July, 1848. He was not mayor of Indianapolis, but a journalist residing in La Fayette. On p. 237, "G. F. Vinton" should be "S. F. Vinton." On p. 269, L. D. Campbell is referred to as a Free Soiler in 1848; he was a Whig. The volume is well printed, and attractively presented in other respects, while in the matter of style, its chief fault is the lack of smoothness. This fault, however, was not easily avoided in a narrative abounding in so many particular facts and minute details.

GEORGE W. JULIAN.

*History of California.* By THEODORE H. HITTELL. Vols. III. and IV. (San Francisco: N. J. Stone and Co. 1897. Pp. 981, 858.)

THE earlier volumes of Mr. Theodore Hittell's *History of California* covered the period preceding the admission of the state into the Union. The present volumes conclude the entire work, extend their story as far as the death of Governor Bartlett, in 1887, and deal with the periods of the early mining life, the great Vigilance Committee, the political struggles before the war, and the industrial and political developments since the war.

The disposition of the extensive material is substantially as follows:—Book VIII. of the whole work, with which the third volume opens, discusses, in fourteen chapters, covering some 330 pages, the "Early Mining Life." In this book, Chapter I. gives a general account of the methods and conditions of the early stages of placer mining life; Chapters II. and III. give some of the annals of the "northern mines;" Chapter IV. is devoted in a similar way to the "southern mines;" and Chapter V. tells some of the stories of the early gold excitement, with their attendant "results." Hereupon, the chapters from the sixth to the ninth, inclusive, portray the social conditions and general "characteristics" of the early miners, at considerable length, the treatment being based upon those countless anecdotes, as well as more or less contemporaneous reports, which memory and travellers' and pioneers' narratives have preserved, in one form or another, until now. The development of miners' law, the struggle for organization, the varieties of Lynch law, and, finally, the first large Vigilance Committee of San Francisco, in 1851, occupy Chapters X. to XIV., and conclude Book VIII.

Book IX. is devoted to the "Progress of San Francisco." After four chapters on the very rapid development that occurred between 1850 and 1854, Chapters V. and VI. of this book discuss the commercial calamities of 1854-55; and Chapter VII. begins the often-told tale of the Vigilance Committee of 1856. The story of the great committee then continues through Chapter XIV., to the close of the Book (p. 649 of the volume).

Book X. deals with a more miscellaneous collection of topics, under the head of "State Growth." The United States Land Commission of 1851 for the settlement of the titles of Mexican origin, the early squatters, the various "anti-foreigner" movements; the filibusters (especially the famous Nicaragua filibuster Walker); the early visits to Humboldt Bay and to Yosemite; the early stages of agriculture; and the Indian wars (including events as late as the Modoc war of 1873), here together fill fourteen chapters, extending to page 981, and so closing the volume.

The fourth and final volume of the whole work contains Books XI. and XII., and is devoted to the political history of the state. This volume begins once more with the admission of California into the Union, and with the administration of the first governor, Peter Burnett. The titles of the chapters of both books of this volume are usually furnished by the

names of the successive governors; but an exception is made in the case of the famous politician and senator Broderick, who was killed by Terry in the noted duel in 1859, and in the case of the Pacific Railroads and of the new constitution of 1879. These topics receive treatment in chapters with special titles.

Of the two volumes here in question, the third is of most interest to the general student of American history, although there are also various episodes in the fourth volume which have a decidedly general national interest. For example, the career of Broderick and his famous rivalry with Gwin are, from any point of view, notable incidents of the period of ante-bellum politics; the forces that kept California in the Union during the war must interest every student of the fortunes of the Republic at that time; the completion of the first Pacific Railroad, and the rather unexpected social and economic sequel of that enterprise, are matters of national importance; and the story of the struggles that led to the new constitution of 1879, including the annals of the "Sand Lots," must form a part of the complete history of our more recent social processes in this country. Mr. Hittell's work has no very dangerous rival as an extensive and careful portrayal of just these matters, so far as he has found material accessible. The early history of the province of California has been more extensively, and on the whole somewhat better told in the volumes prepared under the general direction of Mr. H. H. Bancroft than in Mr. Hittell's first two volumes of his California history. But for the period since the admission of California, the Pacific Coast histories of Mr. Bancroft's well-known series are much more unequal in character and far less scholarly than the earlier volumes; and any one who wants to be clear as to the basis upon which statements bearing upon California matters since 1850 are to rest, will, in this portion of the field, hereafter consult Mr. Hittell, until the whole material has received some new presentation. And Mr. Hittell's advantage rather grows the later down his chapters come in the story.

Meanwhile the general student will easily find Mr. Hittell's treatment too diffuse, his style colorless, and open to a good many literary objections, and his method not precisely the ideal one for a local history. For the method is one that runs to seemingly endless detail, and that uses too few summaries, and too few general points of view. But the defects do not prevent these volumes from being, for their purpose, a really admirable product of labor and devotion. They are often rough-hewn and uneven. Trivial facts or reports stand side by side with serious matters. There is a frequent lack of perspective. But Mr. Hittell makes the most studious efforts to be impartial, to avoid hero-worship, to subordinate his obvious and intense local patriotism to a purely objective concern for the truth, to keep clear of all unnecessary controversy, to be thorough-going, and even (what is hardest of all for the local historian) to be just to the relative importance of the various branches of his complex subject. It is in this last respect that, as just pointed out, he is especially open to criticism, but his efforts, at least, are constant and ob-

vious. The general disposition of the materials, as just sketched, will seem at first sight, no doubt, to any student unacquainted with California, unnecessarily awkward. For why, one may say, should Volume IV. begin afresh with the admission of the state, when Volume III. has brought the story of social conditions and of Indian wars down to such comparatively recent dates? Yet, as a fact, the disposition in question is in its general outlines only too natural, in view of a certain rather unhappy divorce between the social and the political life of the state—a divorce which long characterized just this community. The miner and the politician, the Vigilance Committee man and the governor of the state, the filibuster, the squatter and the warrior with Indians,—all these are products of California whose fortunes and whose interests were for a long time far too independent of one another. The awkwardness of the story is in so far really due to the essential awkwardness and waywardness of the life portrayed. Government and society long lived, as it were, in two connected, but far too independent worlds.

As for a very few details, that may serve to guide a reader's interest in these volumes:—The sketch of the social conditions of the early mining-camp life is still rather disappointingly at the mercy of mere anecdotes. The actual factors and forces at work are rather imperfectly analyzed. After all that has been written upon the topic, one regrets to find the material so little reduced to a definitely classified and orderly form, and still so much left in the region of mere gossip. The land troubles are dealt with in a judicial spirit, and upon some matters, such as the pueblo claims at San Francisco, Mr. Hittell preserves his independence of judgment in despite of the decision of the courts. The very extensive and minute narrative of the great Vigilance Committee of 1856 takes account of all the latest materials, and maintains the traditional Californian view of the affair with great coolness and skill, and even with more fairness of tone towards some of the opponents of the Committee than one sometimes finds. As for the relation of California to the breaking-out of the Civil War, one is indeed again disappointed to find that Mr. Hittell, after all his opportunities to collect material, has so little that is new to say, although what he says is indeed obvious and sensible enough so far as it goes. There must surely be material in existence, in regard to this crisis in California, which would repay a careful monographic study. The account of the "Sand-Lot" and of the new constitution of 1879 is almost provokingly dispassionate, as well as almost wholly free from the sociological observations that would be, in these days, natural enough. In fact, Mr. Hittell's self-restraint as to all matters of generalization, here as elsewhere, seems to go too far; for he shows a practised judgment whenever he chooses to express himself in more general fashion; and his few summaries, where they occur, are always welcome.

Extensive sections of these volumes will have only a local interest; but the state of California, in any shape, deserves the careful attention of the student of American history. These volumes close with a copious index to the whole work.

JOSIAH ROYCE.

*The Secession and Reconstruction of Tennessee.* By JAMES WALTER FERTIG, A.M. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1898. Pp. 108.)

THIS brief monograph, which is Mr. Fertig's doctor's dissertation, undoubtedly possesses permanent value. It contains a straightforward and instructive account of the success of secession in Tennessee, of Johnson's military government and of the Brownlow régime up to the time when Tennessee was re-admitted to statehood. It also traces the thread of congressional debate upon the status of the seceded states and shows how the presidential plan of reconstruction was purposely and effectually thwarted by joint resolution of Congress even in the case of Tennessee. The narrative is not overburdened with details; yet every important event and every significant fact, whether elaborately set forth or merely mentioned, seems to have been properly allowed for in the conclusions reached.

On only one point of importance must the author's statement be challenged. He is mistaken in believing that a "military government" like that of Johnson "was at that time a term unknown to the history and laws both of the state and of the nation." A precedent is found in the last war before the Civil War, in the military government of New Mexico and Upper California both before and after the conclusion of peace with Mexico. It is sufficient here to call attention to two U. S. Supreme Court cases: *Cross v. Harrison*, 16 Howard 164 (1853), and *Leitensdorfer v. Webb*, 20 Howard 176 (1857), wherein the documents and authorities are cited. Varied and interesting are the duties which the military government is called upon to perform in behalf of civil and even of political rights before it is possible to substitute legally established civil government in place of the conquering military power.

The study is quite as interesting from the political as from the constitutional standpoint. Andrew Johnson was conscientious and loyal, but uncompromising even unto vindictiveness. So was Brownlow, and neither was a wise statesman. Mr. Fertig's narrative makes it clear that the oaths which Governor Johnson required of voters in addition to those prescribed by the President irritated the people, outraged the conservatives, aroused the radicals, disclosed their strength, gave them the advantage, led to the reorganization of a radical state government, made feasible the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment and so led to the favorable action of Congress. Tennessee escaped congressional reconstruction and carpet-bag government by dint of falling into the hands of the radicals, from whom she escaped by a *coup de main* in 1870.

In addition to official publications the author has used files of Nashville papers covering the whole period. Files of other state papers are rare if they exist at all. A file of Brownlow's tri-weekly *Whig*, Knoxville, for at least the first five months of 1861, can be found in the library of Yale University. Typographically the publication is not creditable to the press which issued it.

FREDERICK W. MOORE.



*The Life of David Dudley Field.* By HENRY M. FIELD. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1898. Pp. 361.)

THIS is a pious work by the Reverend Doctor Field in commemoration of his eldest brother. It seems designed rather as a memorial for the family than as a book for general reading. And its examination from that viewpoint affords a justification for what otherwise might be considered the disproportionate space awarded to the merits of the subject's ancestors, and others of his kindred, which includes even an account of the success of one of his descendants at a school examination. It is written in a kindly spirit and contains not a word which can give pain to any of his enemies. In the dedication to his brother, Mr. Justice Field, the author modestly apologizes for the fact that the task had been assigned to himself, a layman, who cannot fill in the "professional details." Yet a careful search has disclosed but one erroneous statement of the law, which is at pages 202 and 203, where Doctor Field says of the *McCardle* case, in which the constitutionality of one of the Reconstruction acts was argued before the Supreme Court: "Congress itself hastened to repeal the act in which it had assumed an authority which it did not possess." That statute was not repealed; but before the decision, on account of an intimation that it might be held unconstitutional, the act giving the court jurisdiction of the appeal was repealed and *McCardle* pardoned (*Ex parte McCardle*, 7 Wall. 506). But although the book is in spirit and execution praiseworthy if not blameless, it fails to give any adequate idea of the life and character of its protagonist or even of the reforms which he accomplished. A record of the latter, however, has been preserved for posterity in the three volumes of the *Speeches and Papers of David Dudley Field*, published before he died. Of the former it is perhaps too soon to attempt an accurate description.

In stature as well as intellect looking down upon the rest, he was for many years the most conspicuous figure at the New York bar. At an age when most of his contemporaries were dead and the rest too feeble to work, he continued till he was over eighty actively engaged in practice, advising conduct and drafting papers in transactions involving millions of dollars, and arguing the most important cases of the day. His extensive study of the history of pleading and practice, a field which from its dryness is usually neglected by the lawyer, made him unrivalled in fertility of resource; equally acute in defense to harass and delay his adversary by technical objections to the form of procedure and the nature of the relief asked, and ready when for the plaintiff to demand and obtain summary justice by the use of some new remedy invented for the occasion but supported by analogies from obsolete writs of which the opposing counsel and the judge had never previously read or heard. This power, combined with a profound knowledge of human nature, the weaknesses of which he understood, and a devotion to the interests of his clients which ignored fear or hope of favor from other sources, made him the greatest master of the strategy of litigation that the world has ever seen. In lucidity, simplicity, and precision of style as a draughtsman of plead-



ings, instruments, and statutes he was also without a peer. In the accomplishments which attract attention to an advocate in court, he was not so pre-eminent. In the art of cross-examination, he made no such reputation as that of O'Connor, Bangs, Fullerton and Choate. The graces of oratory, also, he did not possess, although he tried to cultivate them. He could not expand and reiterate an argument with varied illustrations. His perorations were often awkward if not turgid. He dominated and at times bullied, but rarely if ever conciliated the bench. It was by logic, clearness of statement and personal force that he won his greatest victories in argument.

The reputation of the lawyer, however, is ephemeral; and had his life been confined to the practice at the bar he would soon have been forgotten. David Dudley Field was spurred by an ambition to acquire something greater than wealth or professional pre-eminence, both of which he easily attained. He wished to leave not only his clients but the world his debtor, and for that he devoted his learning and technical training to the removal of the obstructions to the administration of justice which for centuries had always delayed and too often defeated suitors in England as well as the United States. Alone and unaided he undertook the task. His hand and brain pointed out the way, argued the practicability and expedience of fusing law and equity together, and drew the statutes by which that fusion was accomplished. The work was colossal and its opponents numerous, able and bitter. They comprised almost the entire bar of his own state, who found fault with his phraseology, denied the possibility of what he attempted, and compared "Jack Code" with Jack Cade. But his untiring energy persuaded the people of his own state to outvote the lawyers. And the success of the experiment in New York procured its imitation, with the approval of the bar, in almost every system of jurisprudence founded upon the common law throughout the world. In his later years, he dwelt with just pride upon the fact that he found at the Antipodes, in British China, India, Australia and Ceylon as well as in England, Canada, and more than twenty-seven states of his own country, judges daily enforcing statutes containing language written by him at Stockbridge forty years before.

For this posterity will not forget him. Greater than Bentham, he accomplished and himself framed the principal measures of reform which he preached upon the housetops. Unlike that of Napoleon and Justinian, his work was performed in the face of the most stubborn resistance and practically alone. And so long as Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence is administered his name will be held in grateful remembrance.

ROGER FOSTER.

*Cases on American Constitutional Law.* Edited by CARL EVANS BOYD, Ph.D. (Chicago: Callaghan and Co. 1898. Pp. xi, 678.)

THIS is a short collection of cases for the use of college and law-school classes. It is based upon the larger and valuable collection edi-

ted by Professor James Bradley Thayer of the Harvard Law School. It contains but two cases not in its model; and should be used only by students who are too poor to buy Thayer's *Cases*. It is confined to decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States; and the omission of head-notes, which seems to be considered necessary in books prepared for use in the case system of instruction, makes it useless to the practitioner.

The work of the editor and publisher seems to be well done. The type, paper and binding are excellent, although the failure to cite volumes and pages in the table of cases is an irritating blemish. The Income Tax cases and the Debs case are included in the collection. And the notes, so far as they go, are accurate and fit for their object, the instruction of the beginner.

The modesty of the preface disarms the critic. The size of the volume affords an adequate excuse for the exclusion of many cases, which we should expect to find there. There are, however, a few omissions which we think will make the book tend to mislead the student. The editor should have added a note referring to the later cases which have limited the effect of the Dartmouth College case (4 Wheaton 518). The Original Package cases (*Peirce v. The State of New Hampshire*, 5 Howard 504, and *Leisy v. Hardin*, 135 U. S. 100) should also be accompanied by a note showing that they have been obviated, so far as the sale of intoxicating liquor is concerned, by an Act of Congress (August 8, 1890, 26 St. at L. 313) which was held by a divided court to be constitutional, *In re Rahrer* (140 U. S. 545). A reference should also have been made to the first South Carolina Liquor cases, *Scott v. Donald* (165 U. S. 58), *Same v. Same* (165 U. S. 107). We presume that the last South Carolina Liquor cases, *Vance v. W. A. Vandercook Co.* (170 U. S. 438) and the last Oleomargarine cases, *Schollenberger v. Pennsylvania* (171 U. S. 1) and *Collins v. New Hampshire* (171 U. S. 30), were reported after Doctor Boyd's book was in press.

Doctor Boyd appends to his report of the Slaughter House Cases (16 Wall. 36), a note containing only a quotation from a statement by Mr. Justice Miller, in 1887, fourteen years after the decision, saying that "no attempt to override or disregard this elementary decision of the effect of the three new constitutional amendments upon the relation of the state governments to the Federal government has been made." The editor should have added to this the information for the student that the principles laid down in this opinion have now been overruled. The Supreme Court has held repeatedly that the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment covers the white as well as the colored races and forbids discrimination upon other grounds than race, color or previous condition of servitude (*e. g.*, *Gulf, Colorado and Santa Fe Railway Co. v. Ellis*, 165 U. S. 180). And the late case of *Allgeyer v. Louisiana* (165 U. S. 578) holds squarely that the Fourteenth Amendment gives to the Supreme Court of the United States the power to hold void all state legislation, which in its opinion unreasonably restricts the right to pursue a lawful calling. This decision and that which upheld the Utah Ten

Hour Law (Holden v. Hardy, 169 U. S. 366) should have been at least cited in this collection.

ROGER FOSTER.

Mr. Samuel N. Norton, of Rio Vista, California, sends us a handy little pamphlet entitled *Days and Dates*, which presents ingenious and, so far as we have tested them, accurate tables for finding the day of the week on which any date from A. D. 1000 to A. D. 2282 fell or will fall, by Old Style or by New Style. Useful as the tables will no doubt be to persons who have no more extensive handbook of chronology, the letterpress which accompanies them is not impeccable. It is an error to say that all Catholic nations at once adopted "New Style" upon its installation by Pope Gregory, October 4, 1582. It is a similar error to say that in September 1752 all Protestant nations, following England's example, adopted that style. The author speaks of the enactments of Romulus and Numa with respect to the calendar as well-established matters of fact. The pamphlet closes with a concordance of the French Revolutionary calendar with the Gregorian; it is one day out for the years IV. and VIII.

Mr. Joseph H. Crooker's little book on *The Growth of Christianity* (Chicago, Western Unitarian Sunday-school Society, pp. 241) is the result of a modest and earnest attempt to give a purely rational account of Christian history, chiefly for the use of Sunday-schools. For such purposes it is perhaps too fluid and abstract, assuming or leaving at one side the solid structure of concrete facts which Sunday-school pupils so much need, and taking rather the form of a comment on Christian history already known. The comment is conceived distinctly from the point of view of Unitarianism, and is, as might be expected, enthusiastic for liberty and optimistic with respect to human nature. While its denominational tone is seldom narrow, no slight distortion of view in respect to the relative importance of different portions of church history might easily be produced by the disproportionate space which the book gives to the Trinitarian controversies in early times, and those relating to Arminianism and religious freedom in later years. Some portions of the author's prodigious field have to be slighted in consequence. Yet the book is in many ways unusually good among manuals so brief.

The authors ("H. M. and M. A. R. T.") of a *Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome* (London, Adam and Charles Black) have planned "to give the visitor to Rome full information about the Christian side of its history, about Roman churches, ceremonies and customs, which does not fall within the scope" of Murray's and other guide-books. Their first volume, now published, a volume of 547 pages, of a mechanical execution well adapted to its purpose, is devoted to The Christian Monuments of Rome. The subject of the second will be The Liturgy in Rome. The third will deal with Monasticism in Rome and

with Ecclesiastical Rome in other senses. The present volume is largely historical in character. It contains a very large amount of fresh and useful information on churches and catacombs in general, and on each church and catacomb in particular, and many a traveller who can make a long stay in Rome will be benefited by its use. In the way of criticism it must be said that, in those sections which are general in their nature, the authors have not always followed systematically a logical arrangement. There is a good deal of skipping back and forth, and more or less discourse, always interesting to be sure, on points which more properly belong in the second volume.

It is fortunate for the general public that the best scholarship of England is willing to devote itself to filling up the innumerable historical "series" which are now running. Hassall's *Louis XIV.*, Poole's *Wycliffe*, Hutton's *Philip Augustus*, and Tout's *Edward I.*, each in a different series, have now a worthy companion in Hodgkin's *Charles the Great* in the "Foreign Statesmen" series. The author has already set his own standard for this sort of work in his *Theodoric the Goth*, and the present book is an even better specimen of the best kind of popular writing. One feels a little tendency to resent what seems like a waste of already meagre space when he finds one-third the book occupied with a history of the earlier Carolingians, but the work is really a marvel of disguised condensation and one cannot fail to be astonished at the ease and skill with which so much of the history of the times is told in 250 pages. The narrative follows the sources very closely with copious translations, and many passages which are not between quotation marks are hardly more than translations from Einhard or the chroniclers, and, of course, one finds little to criticize in Hodgkin, unless he makes much of some difference of opinion. It seems to have been pretty clearly proved, however, that Adelgisel and Ansegisel were two different persons, and that Martin was the paternal uncle of Pippin of Heristal; in describing Charles Martel's use of the church lands it is plainly implied that this included only the appointment of his friends to church offices, omitting entirely the far more important *precaria verbo regis*; and in saying that feudalism does not go back into Merovingian days, while the statement is in terms accurate, it is so made as to convey a wrong impression regarding the origin of feudal institutions.

The first two *fasciculi* of Vol. XVII. of the *Analecta Bollandiana* (Brussels, Société des Bollandistes, 1898, pp. 264, 48) is mainly occupied with the presentation and discussion of the hagiographical materials derived from three related collections,—the martyrology of Wolfhard of Hasern, the collection which (because its chief manuscripts sprang from five Austrian monasteries) is called the *Magnum Legendarium Austriacum*, and the *Legendarium* of Windberg. The mutual relations of these *Legendaries* are examined with studious care. Then follow a considerable number of the contributions to hagiology which are contained in them.

Of these perhaps the most interesting are lives of two Irish bishops, Mo-chuille and Ronan. The former has no direct value for Irish history; the latter is to be discussed in the forthcoming November volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*. M. Ulysse Chevalier's *Repertorium Hymnologicum*, which has hitherto been published in supplements to the *Analecta*, having now been completed, the present *fasciculus* offers the first part of a catalogue of the Greek hagiographical manuscripts of the Vatican.

*The Ancestry of John Whitney*, by Henry Melville, A.M. (New York, De Vinne Press, pp. xviii, 295.) One may well believe that the author of this book spent "four years of investigation," and a great deal of money besides, in preparing and publishing it. It is quite the handsomest and most interesting book of the kind we have met. It appears, moreover, to have been worth doing—whether upon so sumptuous a scale is another question. To many it must be a book worth having—an edition of six hundred has been printed; but who can stand the charge?

Perhaps we ought not to speak of "books of the kind." The truth is, there are few books like this one. It is more than a book of genealogy, though there is much genealogy in it; it is less than a book of history or of biography, though there is much history and biography in it. So far as it is a work of genealogy, it travels far afield as compared with American works of that name. The whole field is different; it begins indeed where American genealogy delights to begin, if only it can—with an ancestor firmly fixed and located in England; but thence it runs upstream instead of down, to the sources. As a book of history, which sensibly enough it does not pretend to be, it could only pass as a scrappy piece of second-hand work.

The book is a sort of historic-genealogy, as nearly as words can hit it; giving an account of the English Whitneys, of Whitney on the picturesque Wye in Herefordshire, from the first appearance of the family in known records to the last. The two extremes are the thirteenth and the seventeenth centuries. The story is a striking instance of the mutation of familiar names; once familiar in England, Whitney now is scarcely known except as an American and Canadian name. The last Sir Thomas died without issue about two years before the death of the emigrant John, his second cousin and nearest male relative. "There are probably as many of the name to-day," says the author, "in some Massachusetts village as can be found in all England."

A sturdy, aggressive race, the Whitneys, seated in the Marches of Herefordshire, over against the Welshman, from the first played a part, at times conspicuous enough, for good or ill, to satisfy the family pride of their descendants to-day. What part they played from century to century is told in this book, in chapters severally entitled, "The Whitneys of the Thirteenth Century," "of the Fourteenth Century," "of the Fifteenth Century" and "of the Sixteenth Century," with a preliminary chapter on "The Origin and Early History of the Whitney Family" and a final chapter on "The Last of the Whitneys of Whitney."



The chapters are not merely founded upon records, they are largely made up of them. Indeed, the book is a collection of materials for a history of the English Whitneys, with connecting narrative. The records are given with sufficient fulness, mostly in translation; the connecting narrative is told not without good sense and taste. The book abounds with excellent illustrations of places in the valley of the Wye, and there is a large "Map of the Whitney Estate with its Surroundings" as it appeared in 1895. Fac-similes of documents also abound. Genealogical appendices and an index, no better than it should be, close a volume, bound in vellum covers held together by stout ties and stamped with the Whitney arms.

MELVILLE M. BIGELOW.

Mr. Julian S. Corbett, of whose *Drake and the Tudor Navy* we expect to take more especial notice later, has edited for the Navy Records Society a volume of *Papers relating to the Navy during the Spanish War, 1585-1587* (London, The Society, pp. l, 363) which illustrates in a very interesting manner the period of war, or rather of general reprisals on the high seas, which preceded the year of the Armada. The documents come mostly from the "State Papers, Domestic," at the Public Record Office, though some of the most important are derived from the Lansdowne and other collections at the British Museum. They are arranged in three divisions. The first contains narratives, despatches and letters of intelligence, etc., which relate to Drake's "Indies voyage" of 1585-1586, and prove that this was not, as has perhaps generally been thought, a haphazard raid, but "a thoroughly well conceived, if ambitious, design to destroy the sources of Spanish transatlantic commerce and ruin her colonial empire." The second collection of papers relates to the Cadiz voyage of 1587. The documents here printed make clearer than ever before the high strategical importance of Drake's seizure of Cape St. Vincent, which is shown to be, not a mere incident, insignificant and inexplicable save as an act of bravado, but an intentional achievement having results at least as important as those which flowed from the fight in Cadiz harbor or the capture of the *San Felipe*. The greater number of these papers, however, relate to the quarrel between Drake and the vice-admiral, Borough. Part III. consists of papers bearing on questions of admiralty administration, especially Hawkins's administration and the attacks made upon him, and on matters of naval ordnance. The subject of guns and gunnery in the Tudor navy is treated with great learning and clearness in an appendix. The introduction is a model of lucid exposition, and the notes are all that one could desire or expect, even from Mr. Corbett.

Dr. Guernsey Jones, of the University of Nebraska, in his Heidelberg dissertation entitled *The Diplomatic Relations between Cromwell and Charles X. Gustavus of Sweden* (Lincoln, Neb., State Journal Co., pp. 89), has printed an admirable monograph on an interesting subject.



The relations of Cromwell with Sweden after the abdication of Christina had an important connection with the project of a general Protestant alliance which stood so near his heart and at times so strongly influenced his policy. The negotiations between the Protector and the Swedish king were hampered, and at length made abortive, by a radical difference of objects. Charles Gustavus was less concerned to fight against Catholicism than to assure to himself the control of the Baltic by making war on Denmark and opposing the Dutch, while England's commercial interests, of which Cromwell was ever mindful, as well as his political and religious projects, impelled him to promote peace and equilibrium among the naval and commercial powers of the Baltic. Dr. Jones has followed out the story of the working-out of these cross-purposes with great care and good judgment, using apparently all the printed matter, English, Dutch, Swedish and German, that was accessible in London, and much manuscript material at the British Museum, the Bodleian, and the Public Record Office. He has not examined the despatches of the Swedish ambassadors in London, though we should suppose that they would be highly important and that copies of them could readily be obtained from Stockholm; but Pufendorf and other writers have given him summaries of some of them. His style cannot be praised.

*The Life of Judge Jeffreys.* By H. B. IRVING, M.A. OXON. (New York, Longmans, pp. 380.) This work does not contain one uninteresting page. Every lawyer who has a taste for the literature of his profession should place it on his shelves by the side of Campbell's *Lives*. And all who enjoy history should read it. The style, with the exception of a few cheap similes, is temperate and attractive. The type and paper are pleasing to the eye; and there is but one fault in the work of the publisher, a serious one in a biography, the failure to head the pages with the date of the text in the year of our Lord and that of the subject's age.

Like most biographers at the end of this century, Mr. Irving tries to extenuate the faults of his hero. The omission to cite at the foot of each page the authorities for his assertions makes it often hard to decide as to the soundness of his defense. But he clearly scores a few points against the Whigs, and sufficiently establishes the inaccuracy of some of the rhetorical flourishes of Campbell and the reckless falsity of much of the narrative of Macaulay, who in at least one case has invented a speech which Jeffreys never uttered.

Although, however, this biographer has subdued the portraits made by his predecessors, has shown some of the provocations for the outrages perpetrated by the judge, and has suggested the reasons which may have seemed to the actor justifications for them, the result has been merely to make the judicial monster more human, not to change any of the characteristics which had been heretofore attributed to him. This book makes it easier to believe that he existed, but it does not relieve the horror which an account of his acts must always inspire in the mind of any healthy man. Insolent in success, cowardly to the point of grovelling

when rebuffed; servile to the great, bullying the low; callous to all human suffering except his own, to which he was most tender; coarse and vulgar on the bench, deciding cases in conformity with the will of those who had the power to gratify his ambition; always a judicial tyrant, and at times a judicial murderer, posterity has continued for him the hate which he received from his contemporaries; and justly, to the end of time, when men wish to describe a tyrannical and wicked judge, they will say that a Jeffreys has come to judgment.

ROGER FOSTER.

Dr. George C. Williamson, who in 1895 published a life of John Russell and in 1896 one of Richard Cosway, has written for "The Connoisseur Series" a book entitled *Portrait Miniatures* (London, George Bell and Sons, pp. 170), designed as a handbook for collectors who do not buy Dr. Propert's elaborate and expensive *History of Miniature Art*. The chapter on the early English miniaturists, that on Hilliard, Oliver and Cooper, and those dealing with most of the artists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, are based on that book; those on painters in enamel and on foreign miniaturists on other standard books. More original are the chapters on Cosway and the two Plimers, those on modern work and the most notable collections of the present time, and those which give advice, marked by much good sense and moderation, on collecting and on the bibliography of the subject. The volume is illustrated by nearly two hundred excellent reproductions of miniatures or enamels, either in collotype or in process, showing many of the finest examples of the art, and enabling its history to be followed with considerable satisfaction.

*Skalpieren in Nordamerika.* Von Premierleutnant Geo. Friederici, (Sonder-Abdruck aus Band LXXIII., Nr. 13. u. 14. des *Globus*, Braunschweig, 1898). This brochure by Lieutenant Friederici contains a mass of historical and ethnologic information upon the subject discussed. The references are necessarily more historical than ethnologic, for the reason that superficial observation of Indian customs began with the discovery of America, while the intelligent investigation of their meaning dates back only a few years.

The author finds indications of the practice of scalping among the ancient Germans, Gauls, Jews and Scythians, the Malays and African negroes, as well as among the Indians of both Americas. In America it was most general among the tribes north of Mexico, and was observed in Canada as early as 1535.

Students of American history are well aware that the custom of scalping was not only encouraged, but systematically practised by the rival French and English colonists, but the mass of testimony which the author has collected is something astonishing. For over a hundred years human scalps, of Indian, French or English, men, women or children, were a marketable commodity with value fixed by legislation, being usually

quoted higher in Boston than in Quebec. In one noted instance even a minister of the gospel engaged in the business at the rate of one hundred pounds per scalp. As late as 1863 the territory of Idaho authorized "for every scalp of a buck \$100, for every woman \$50, and for everything in the shape of an Indian under ten years \$25."

The scalp yell, the scalp dance, and the method of preparing the scalp are described, but the author says little concerning the importance attached to scalps in connection with religious mysteries. This branch of the subject remains still to be investigated. The idea that the Indian believed that scalping prevented his entrance into the Indian heaven is probably only a popular error.

JAMES MOONEY.

Miss Edith Sichel's *The Household of the Lafayettees* (London, Constable and Co.; New York, Macmillan, 1897, pp. 348), is extremely interesting; one could read it through at one sitting, had one time. Of course the character of the subject goes a good way, but the intrinsic interest in this precise subject, it is one of Miss Sichel's merits to have discerned. Heretofore the career of Lafayette had not appeared to me as a subject for romance, either in fiction or in good glowing facts. But Miss Sichel regards the Noailles and Lafayettees as representatives of the best, but least appreciated element of the old nobility and presents this matter as well as she does the amorphisms of the Revolution; she gives us account of the horrors of the Revolutionary prisons in Paris as well as of the lot of Lafayette when himself exile and captive; she has the opportunity to describe the Christian idealism of Mme. Lafayette, as well as the zeal for liberty of her husband. A good subject then, as well as a very well written book. It goes without saying that in a book which implies a *résumé* of the history of the most important half-century of modern times will be constant occurrence of ideas and opinions, as to events and men, with which many will heartily disagree. But such a book as this is to be read by those who have already some knowledge, and such will not be likely to be led far astray. If we are to push criticism to rigor I think I must say that the book on the whole impresses me as being more picturesque than intellectual, that it does not give us the theories of Lafayette as definitely as it does Lafayette the theorist, that although we feel that all this must have been much as it is here set down, we are not quite sure how it was that it all came to be. Lafayette—possibly not a difficult character—seems rather too near the hero of an old-fashioned novel. Dryasdust in his fever for facts often suspects the lighter touch. Still one reads a book like this not to borrow ideas ready-made but to stimulate one's own thinking, and for this purpose it is amply and excellently sufficient.

EDWARD E. HALE, JR.

Dr. Lauros G. McConachie, in his *Congressional Committees* (New York, T. Y. Crowell and Co., no date, pp. 441) has a subject which has long demanded thorough and scholarly examination. Such an investiga-

tion he has evidently bestowed. It is impossible not to admire the extent of his reading in the voluminous sources, and the fulness of his knowledge. Not less admirable is the author's insight into the conditions of congressional life in the past and in recent times. He has great skill in observation of the developments of parliamentary procedure and in reflection upon them. It is a pity, therefore, that he has such unfortunate methods of presentation. His style is distressingly turgid; for example, his last sentence reads thus (he is speaking of the United States Senate): "Across its narrow way we still peer back into the regions whence we have come,—see the morning of the world, the marches of the Teuton forests, Hellenic tribal bounds, snowy-haired patriarchs of Orient, the solitary cave-dweller gazing out over Britain's untamed seas." Very likely we do; the present reviewer would be slow to affirm that we do not; but is this the style in which to write of the history of parliamentary procedure? The fault is not simply one of taste; the constant excess of rhetoric, the inability to say a plain thing in plain language, makes it frequently difficult to get the author's meaning. Yet surely few topics more strenuously demand simplicity and directness than the history of legislative methods. It is a pity the author could not have caught the terse precision of Hatsell or the limpid clearness of Jefferson. Moreover, the arrangement of the book lacks order and method to a really surprising degree. Many students will resort to the book, inevitably; the information they seek will often be in it; but they will often have great difficulty in knowing where to find it, or into what words of plain English to translate it when found. The chapter on committees before 1789 is noticeably imperfect.

In his little book called *Seven Months a Prisoner* (Scribner, pp. 258) Mr. J. V. Hadley tells an interesting, at times even thrilling, tale of military adventure during the Civil War. It is a pleasing and apparently veracious addition to the number of such narratives, told in a straightforward manner, and with an old-time flavor of that "unreconstructed" feeling toward Secession and all its works which we so readily excuse in old prisoners.

Dr. Thomas W. Bicknell has, with exemplary devotion, explored the annals of his native town, and produced a creditable *History of Barrington, Rhode Island* (Providence, the author, pp. 616). The book is much larger and more important than his *Sketches of Barrington* (1870). Dr. Bicknell cannot resist the temptation to begin his narrative of Barrington with the visit of the Northmen, nor is he always critical in his treatment of times considerably later. His identification of "Sowams," the home of Massasoit, with Barrington rather than with Warren, will raise some clamor, yet has much good argument in its favor. The history of the settlement in its successive relations as part of the colonies of Plymouth, Massachusetts Bay and Rhode Island is traced with minute care and much intelligence. The later portions of the book, beside

the usual chapters as to war records, devote more attention than is common to the economic and social history of the town. Many biographies are given.

The fourteenth volume of the *Collections* of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin (pp. 553) opens with a history of Mackinac by the editor, Mr. R. G. Thwaites, corresponding secretary of the society, and an account of early days on the island, by Mrs. Elizabeth Thérèse Baird. Most of the other articles are contributions to one of the three divisions of Wisconsin history to which the articles in recent volumes of the *Collections* have mostly been devoted, the history of military posts in Wisconsin, the history of the early missions within its borders, and the history of the various bodies of foreign population settled therein. Military history is chiefly represented in this volume by careful histories of Fort Winnebago and of Lincoln's participation in the Black Hawk War; missionary history by documents relating to the history of the Episcopal and Catholic missions at Green Bay and Little Chute, and by an account of Father Samuel Mazzuchelli. The foreign groups dealt with are the Cornishmen, the Icelanders and the Germans, whose local origins in Germany are carefully traced.

In Vol. VIII., Part 3, of the *Collections* of the Minnesota Historical Society (pp. 271-542), the most important contributions to history are General Richard W. Johnson's history of Fort Snelling from its foundation to the present time, and Lieutenant David L. Kingsbury's account of Sully's expedition against the Sioux in 1864. There is also an article on the history of mining and quarrying in the territory and state, by the secretary of the society, Mr. Warren Upham. The rest of the volume is mostly taken up with reminiscences of early pioneers, often interesting, but somewhat formless.

## NOTES AND NEWS

Alphonse Wauters, perhaps the most eminent of Belgian historians, died in Brussels on May 2, at the age of eighty-one. His publications, almost all of which bore directly on Belgian history, were very numerous. The most important were: *Histoire de la Ville de Bruxelles*, by him and A. Henne (1843-1845); *Géographie et Histoire des Communes Belges* (1869-1873); *Les Libertés Communales en Belgique* (1869-1878); and the first nine volumes of the *Table Chronologique des Chartes et Diplômes imprimés concernant l'Histoire de la Belgique* (1866-1896).

Dr. Karl Knies, professor of political science in the University of Heidelberg, died in that city on August 3, at the age of seventy-seven. He was one of the most prominent representatives of the historical school among German economists. His most famous work, *Die Politische Oekonomie vom Standpunkte der geschichtlichen Methode*, appeared in 1853. In 1892, after a long series of economic works, he published for the Historical Commission of Baden, *Der briefliche Verkehr Carl Friedrichs von Baden mit Mirabeau und Du Pont*.

Dr. Georg Moritz Ebers, the Egyptologist, died near Munich on August 8, at the age of sixty-one. Though best known by his historical novels, the scene of which was laid in Egypt, he was professor of Egyptology at Leipzig from 1870 to 1893, and had acquired scientific repute by various erudite publications, the most extensive of which was an edition of the important papyrus which he discovered in Egypt in his journey of 1872-1873 and which was called by his name.

Hon. Thomas M. Cooley, formerly chief-justice of Michigan and at a later time head of the Inter-state Commerce Commission, died on September 10, at the age of seventy-four. He was chiefly noted as a jurist and as a writer on constitutional law, but in 1885 published a volume on the history of Michigan in the "American Commonwealths" series.

Mr. William Kelby, formerly librarian of the New York Historical Society, and for many years officially connected with that organization, died in Brooklyn on July 27.

Professor W. J. Ashley of Harvard University will be absent in Europe during the coming academic year. Dr. William Cunningham of Trinity College, Cambridge, will lecture in his stead.

Miss Lucy M. Salmon, professor of history in Vassar College, will spend the coming academic year in study in Europe. Mr. Theodore Clarke Smith will act as her substitute.



Mr. Allen Johnson has been elected professor of history in Iowa College, in the place of Professor Leonard F. Parker, resigned.

At the meeting of the International Congress of Diplomatic History which was held at the Hague during the past month, on the occasion of the enthronement of Queen Wilhelmina, there was distributed to the members a "*Projet provisoire de Statuts*" providing for similar international historical congresses to recur in the future, at intervals of two years, the next to be held at Paris in 1900. The scheme contemplates sessions similar to those of other international congresses of savants, arranged for by a committee of the country in which the meetings are held, and under the honorary presidency of its minister of foreign affairs or of education; an organization into sections for ancient, mediæval, modern and recent history respectively, with sub-divisions; and even the election of "*vingt hautes personnalités de la science*" as a permanent, self-perpetuating "*Académie Internationale de l'Histoire*." Details will be discussed at Paris in 1900.

Upon the model of Iwan von Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Wissenschaften*, a co-operative historical work of great extent entitled *Handbuch der mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte* is being prepared in Germany, under Drs. Georg von Below and Freidrich Meinecke as editors. It is to be published by R. Oldenbourg in Munich, and is to consist of five chief divisions; general, the auxiliary sciences, constitutional-legal-economic, political history, and antiquities, each to consist of several treatises.

Beginning in January 1899 the firm of Hettler, of Leipzig, will publish, under the title *Bibliotheca Historica*, a monthly repertory of references to historical articles in current journals.

The announcements now made for the "Foreign Statesmen Series" include volumes on: Louis XI., by Professor G. W. Prothero; Ferdinand of Aragon, by E. Armstrong; Mazarin, by Arthur Hassall; Louis XIV., by H. O. Wakeman; Catharine II., by J. Bury; and Cavour, by the Countess Cesaresco.

#### ANCIENT HISTORY.

At the beginning of the year 1899 the house of B. G. Teubner, of Leipzig, will begin the publication of an *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*, edited by Dr. Ulrich Wilken, of Breslau, with assistant editors in various countries. The object of the new journal is the publication of articles relating to or derived from the material contained in the thousands of papyri discovered in recent times, or concerning the history of Hellenism in Egypt; texts also, occasionally, and news interesting to those engaged in this special branch of inquiry.

The Oxford University Press is about to issue for the Egypt Exploration Fund the first volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, edited by Messrs. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. The volume will contain 158

texts, a few of which are literary, while a majority are official and private documents, dating from the first to the seventh century of our era.

Professor Ettore Pais of the University of Pisa has published another instalment of his extensive scheme of a general history of ancient Italy. His project comprises two divisions, each of three volumes: a history of Sicily and Magna Graecia, of which the first volume was published in 1894, and a *Storia di Roma*, both to be carried down through the Punic wars, to the time when Italy was unified under Roman rule. Of the second section he has now published Vol. I., Part I., *Critica della Tradizione sino alla Caduta del Decemvirato* (Turin, Carlo Clausen, pp. 629).

Dr. William Fairley's edition of the Monumentum Ancyranum, in the series of *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, published by the University of Pennsylvania, presents the Latin and Greek texts, an English translation, an excellent introduction, and a bibliography. It should do much toward making this fundamental text more widely known among our students.

Mr. Furneaux's edition of the *Agricola* of Tacitus (Oxford, Clarendon Press) is edited with so unusual a degree of attention to the historical, archaeological and topographical problems connected with that treatise as to demand notice of the book in a historical journal.

Professor Dill of Queen's College, Belfast, is completing a work on *Social Life during the last Century of the Roman Empire of the West*, which is to be published before long by Messrs. Macmillan. The volume will deal with such topics as the force and manifestations of pagan sentiment; the moral tone of Roman society; the fiscal administration; the decay of the middle class; the expectations as to the future of the Empire; the relations of Romans with barbarians; and the condition of literary culture and education in the fifth century.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Maspero, *Anciens Testaments Égyptiens* (Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit, 1898, 3); *The Babylonian Discoveries* (Edinburgh Review, April); E. W. Hopkins, *Ancient and Modern Hindu Gilds*, II. (Yale Review, August); G. W. Botsford, *The Trial of the Alcmaeonidae and the Cleisthenean Constitutional Reforms* (Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, VIII.); U. Köhler, *Die Eroberung Asiens durch Alexander den Grossen und der korinthische Bund* (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie, 1898, 6 and 7); B. W. Henderson, *The Campaign of the Metaurus*, I. (English Historical Review, July); E. Beaudouin, *Les grands Domaines dans l'Empire Romain*, V. (Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit, 1898, 3); G. Magliari, *Il Patriziato Romano dal secolo IV. al VIII.* (Studi e Documenti di Storia e Diritto, XVIII. 3-4).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY.

Dr. Cheetham, archdeacon of Rochester, is writing a history of the church from the Reformation to our own times, conceived upon the

model of his own *History of the Early Church*, and of the late Archdeacon Hardwick's books on the church history of the Middle Ages and of the period of the Reformation. The four volumes will thus form a series chronologically complete. Dr. Cheetham's book will be published by Messrs. Macmillan.

The Rev. S. Baring-Gould's new edition of his *Lives of the Saints* (London, J. C. Nimmo), has now been completed by the addition of the sixteenth volume, containing valuable indexes to the whole series.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. F. Hassett, *Primitive Episcopal Elections*, II. (Catholic University Bulletin, July); L. Traube, *Die Regula Sancti Benedicti*; *Geschichte des Textes* (Abhandlungen der K. Bayerischen Akademie, hist. Cl., XXI. 3); A. Ehrhard, *Symeon Metaphrastes und die griechische Hagiographie* (Römische Quartalschrift, XI.).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

M. Paul Sabatier, the biographer of St. Francis of Assisi, has undertaken the publication of a collection of documents for the religious and literary history of the Middle Ages. The first volume makes a valuable beginning by putting forth an edition of the *Speculum Perfectionis seu Sancti Francisci Assisiensis Legenda Antiquissima auctore fratre Leone*.

Father Conrad Eubel has published (Rome, the Vatican press, pp. xlii, 643) the fifth volume of his official *Bullarium Franciscanum, sive Romanorum Pontificum Constitutiones, Epistolae, Diplomata tribus ordinibus . . . concessa*. It covers the years of Benedict XI., Clement V. and John XXII. For the former two pontificates, we are told, the work was not of great difficulty, most of the documents being already in print; but the reign of John XXII. required the examination of sixty thousand documents in the papal archives.

Messrs. Chapman and Hall have in hand a volume entitled *Medical Works of the Fourteenth Century*, transcribed from four manuscripts of that period, edited by Professor Henslow, with introduction and notes by Professor W. W. Skeat.

Mr. M. Macauliffe, formerly of the Indian civil service, sends out a circular letter, originally addressed to the Sikhs, relating to the translation into English of their sacred book, the Granth Sahib, the laborious task upon which he has been for several years engaged, lately under special commission from the Khalsa Diwan. The work is of much importance, not only to the history of a most interesting religion, but incidentally also to portions of the medieval history of India. Mr. Macauliffe's circular is accompanied by a specimen translation of the Japji of Guru Nanak, the morning hymn of the Sikhs, submitted for suggestions. His address is 2. Cantonments, Amritsar, India.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Seeliger, *Volksrecht und Königsrecht* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, 1898, 3); E. Bernheim, *Das Verhältnis der Vita Caroli Magni zu den sogen. Annales Einhardi* (His-

torische Vierteljahrschrift, 1898, 2); K. Zeumer, *Zur Geschichte der Reichssteuern im früheren Mittelalter* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXI. 1); C. Neumann, *Die byzantinische Marine, ihre Verfassung und ihr Verfall* (Historische Zeitschrift, LXXXI. 1); R. Holtzmann, *Die Wahl Friedrichs I. zum deutschen König* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, 1898, 2); P. Fournier, *Deux Controverses sur les Origines du Décret de Gratien* (Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse, III. 2, 3).

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

The recent record publications of the British government include Vol. II. (1313-1317) of the *Patent Rolls of Edward II.*; Vol. IV. (1338-1340) of the *Patent Rolls of Edward III.*; Vol. I. (1547-1563) of the *Calendars of State Papers relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots*, edited by Joseph Bain; Vol. XVII. (1588-1589) of the *Acts of the Privy Council*, edited by Mr. John R. Dasent; a new volume (1690-1691) of the *Calendars of State Papers, Domestic*, of the reign of William and Mary, edited by William J. Hardy; and a list, compiled from documents in the Public Record Office, of the sheriffs of England and Wales from the earliest times to 1831.

In the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for July, M. Alfred Spont reviews recent English historical publications, including a few of those of the United States. M. Charles Bémont has a survey of the recent official archive-publications of the United Kingdom in the September number of the *Revue Historique*.

The Publishing Section of the American Library Association proposes to issue a series of catalogue cards for new books in English history, with annotations prepared by Mr. W. Dawson Johnston indicating briefly the character, scope, sources and value of the books, and referring to important reviews of them. An edition in pamphlet form will also be issued. The address of the Section is 10½ Beacon Street, Boston.

Hon. John W. Fortescue, of the Public Record Office, is writing a *History of the British Army*, of which the first volume will probably be published by Messrs. Macmillan before the end of the present year.

The Society of Gray's Inn intends preparing for publication a portion of its records.

In view of the approaching millennial commemoration of King Alfred, the Clarendon Press intends to publish a new edition of Asser's life of the king, by Mr. W. H. Stevenson.

Mr. H. Thurston has published (Burns and Oates, pp. 680) a *Life of St. Hugh of Lincoln*, translated from the French Carthusian life, and edited with large additions from other sources.

Mr. A. F. Leach has recently completed for the Surtees Society a volume on *Beverley Minster*, the text of which will be a transcript of the act-book or minute-book of the chapter of Beverley, chiefly relating to the years from 1304 to 1325. Mr. Leach's contributions as editor will include much information respecting the minster and its grammar school.

Major-General the Hon. George Wrottesley is publishing, in a strictly limited edition, *Crecy and Calais, from the Public Records*, based upon his discovery, among the Memoranda Rolls of the Exchequer, of writs proving the names of those who accompanied Edward III. on his brilliant expedition, many of whom are still represented in the male line among the English gentry. General Wrottesley, who is himself descended from one of the original Knights of the Garter, Sir Hugh Wrottesley, is issuing the work privately and giving illustrations, in colors and "metals," of all the banners borne by the English at Crecy. His volume, though not published, can be obtained from Messrs. Harrison, 59 Pall Mall, London.

Mr. J. Hamilton Wylie is understood to be working upon a history of the reign of Henry V., to follow his four volumes on Henry IV., of which the last is reviewed in our present issue.

Canon J. T. Fowler, D.C.L., F.S.A., is preparing for publication for the Surtees Society an edition of the *Rites of Durham*. The text, written in 1593 by some one who had known the abbey previous to its dissolution, will be illustrated by two volumes of extracts from the account rolls of the various officers of the abbey—the cellarers, hostillers, chamberlains, almoners, infirmarers, terrars, bursars, sacrists and feretrars.

Mr. Julian S. Corbett is writing a volume which, continuing his *Drake and the Tudor Navy*, will carry on English naval history to the death of Elizabeth.

The Art and Book Company are publishing a history of the Franciscans of England, 1600 to 1850, by Father Thaddeus, a member of the order.

Father Gerard has followed up his previous publications upon the Gunpowder Plot by issuing in a small *opus* called *Thomas Winter's Confession and the Gunpowder Plot* (Harper) an accurate reproduction of Winter's original confession, preserved by the Marquis of Salisbury at Hatfield, together with all other known specimens of the undoubted handwriting of Winter. Father Gerard's view of the plot is upheld by A. Bellesheim in an article in the *Historisch-politische Blätter*, CXXI. 8.

Mr. M. Oppenheim is preparing for the Navy Records Society a complete and revised edition of Sir William Monson's naval tracts. The revised edition is contemplated because of the extreme inaccuracy of the texts published in Churchill's *Voyages*.

Messrs. Goupil and Company expect to publish next spring an elaborately illustrated volume on Oliver Cromwell by Professor Samuel Rawson Gardiner, uniform with the Bishop of London's book on Queen Elizabeth, and that of the late Sir John Skelton on Charles I.

Mr. W. S. Douglas in his book on *Cromwell's Scotch Campaigns, 1650-51* (London, Elliot Stock, pp. 308) makes, with the aid of a minute knowledge of the topography and of the Scottish politics of the period, an important contribution to the history of the Great Rebellion.

The third volume of Mr. W. Laird Clowes's *The Royal Navy* is issued this fall by Messrs. Sampson, Low, Marston and Co. The period covered extends from 1714 to 1793, although the history of voyages and discoveries is continued to 1802. Captain Mahan describes the major operations from 1762 to 1793. The work will be completed in five volumes, ending with the year 1898.

The latest book issued by the Oxford Historical Society (Clarendon Press) is a fourth volume of the *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, extending from Dec. 15, 1712, to Nov. 30, 1714, and continuing his minute record of Oxford transactions.

Rev. John Hunt, author of an esteemed book on *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*, is engaged in writing an account of the life and times of Bishop Hoadly, and of the historic controversies in which he was involved.

Much fresh matter of importance to the fiscal history of Great Britain is contained in a report recently laid on the table of the House of Commons, in which the officials of the National Debt Office for the first time present full details of the history of the funded public debt from 1694 to 1786. The book is mainly the work of Mr. A. T. King, chief clerk of the department.

The last volume published by the Scottish History Society is *The Journal and Papers of John Murray of Broughton*, who was secretary to Prince Charles Edward during the period of the Jacobite rising in 1745, and who subsequently saved himself by informing against Lovat and others. They have been edited by Mr. R. Fitzroy Bell from four volumes of manuscript journals and papers placed at the disposal of the Scottish History Society by Mr. Siddons Murray.

Mr. Andrew Lang has followed up his book on *Pickle the Spy*, noticed in a former volume of the REVIEW (II. 570), by a series of eighteenth-century portraits chiefly relating to the rising of 1745, entitled *The Companions of Pickle*.

Mr. Evelyn Manners has been engaged for several years upon a life of the Marquis of Granby, British commander-in-chief during the Seven Years' War. It is expected to be published this autumn by the Messrs. Macmillan.

In view of the American origin of Count Rumford, founder of the Royal Institution, it will be of interest to many Americans to know that upon the occasion of the one-hundredth anniversary of that establishment, a history of the Institution by its librarian, Mr. Herbert C. Fyfe, will be published.

Messrs. Sampson, Low, Marston and Co. expect to publish this autumn a life of Admiral Lord Lyons, G.C.B., better known as Sir Edmund Lyons (father of Lord Lyons, British minister at Washington during the Civil War), written by Captain S. Eardley-Wilmot, R. N.,



from documents furnished to him by the Duke of Norfolk, whose mother was a daughter of that distinguished naval officer and diplomatist.

The *Memoir of Major-General Sir Henry Crestwicke Rawlinson* by his brother the late Camden professor (Longmans, Green and Co.) not only is of high importance to the history of the East India Company and of Indian affairs during the long period during which Sir Henry Rawlinson was a member of the Council for India, but, as might be expected, contributes in an important degree to the history of European scholarship in the fields of Persian, Assyrian and Babylonian history and antiquities.

*Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve*, formerly editor of the *Edinburgh Review* and registrar of the Privy Council, edited by Professor J. K. Laughton and to be published by Longmans, Green and Co., are now in the press.

It was originally intended that the life of the late Lord Randolph Churchill should be written by Viscount Curzon, to whom all the necessary letters and papers were handed over. It is now announced, however, that Mr. Winston Churchill will undertake the task in the place of Lord Curzon.

The Rev. Archibald Macmillan, minister of Iona, has prepared a work on *Iona, its History, Antiquities*, etc., which is to be published by Messrs. Houlston and Sons. It will contain chapters on the carved stones of Iona by Mr. Robert Brydall of the St. George Art School, Glasgow.

Judge William O'Connor Morris, whose small book upon Irish history from 1494 to 1868 was noticed in the second volume of this REVIEW, has published a more detailed history of *Ireland from 1798 to 1898* (A. D. Innes and Co.)

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Horst, *Die Angelsächsische Chronik* (Englische Studien, XXV. 1 and 2); W. C. Abbott, *Hasting* (English Historical Review, July); Abbé Feret, *Le premier Divorce de Henri VIII.* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); A. F. Pollard, *The Protector Somerset and Scotland* (English Historical Review, July).

#### FRANCE.

To the *Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire* (Paris, Picard) M. G. Fagniez, whose book on the economic history of the reign of Henry IV. was reviewed in our last number, has added a first volume of *Documents relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Industrie et du Commerce en France*. This first volume extends to the end of the thirteenth century.

In the *Bulletin du Protestantisme Français*, LXXIX., M. N. Weiss makes a series of contributions to the history of Calvin, and M. A. Lefranc continues his essay on the religious ideas of Margaret of Navarre.

The Société des Études Historiques expects before long to issue a

*Histoire de la Grande Industrie en France de 1715 à 1789*, prepared from materials in the national and departmental archives by M. Germain Martin.

M. L. de Brotonne, though gleaning after the *Correspondance* and M. Léon Lecestre, in his *Lettres Inédites de Napoléon* (Paris, Champion), has nevertheless by diligent search in most various directions found material for a highly important volume.

The Société d' Histoire Contemporaine will publish during its present year the *Mémoires du Comte de Moré*, of which Balzac issued an edition, now rare, in 1827, and which has relations with the history of the United States; the interesting *Mémoire* of Pons de l' Hérault to the allied powers; and the first of two volumes, edited by M. Romberg, of *Documents relatifs aux Cent-Jours à Gand*. The second of these volumes is ready for the press, as is also the second volume of the *Mémoires de l' Abbé Baston*. The memoirs of M. de Salaberry and the correspondence of Le Coz with Grégoire are also promised for future publication.

M. Edmond Biré is understood to be preparing a critical and annotated edition of Chateaubriand's *Mémoires d' Outre-tombe*.

The centenary of Jules Michelet was celebrated at Paris on July 12 and 13 by official ceremonies, by the university bodies, and by the schools. The *prix d' éloquence* for a study of Michelet was awarded by the French Academy to M. Jean Brunhes, of the University of Fribourg, whose *étude* has been published by Perrin.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Imbart de la Tour, *Les Paroisses rurales dans l'ancienne France*, concl. (*Revue Historique*, September); Dedouvres, *Le Père Joseph Diplomate; Mémoires de quelques Discours Politiques, 1617-1632* (*Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, 1898, 3); F. Funck-Brentano, *Les dernières Années de la Bastille d'après de nouveaux Documents* (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, July); F. A. Aulard, *L' Idée Républicaine et Démocratique avant 1789* (*La Révolution Française*, July 14); F. A. Aulard, *Les Origines du Parti Républicain* (*Revue de Paris*, May 1); E. Velwert, *Les derniers Conventionnels* (*Revue Historique*, September); J. B. Rye, *The Lost and New Letters of Napoleon* (*English Historical Review*, July).

#### ITALY AND SPAIN.

Fasc. I.-II. of Vol. XXI. of the *Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* contains an article by F. Pagnotti on Niccolò da Calvi and his *Vita d' Innocenzo IV.*, with introductory remarks on the pontifical historiography of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and a collection of documents, edited by M. Rosi, on the liberation of the Turkish prisoners taken at the battle of Lepanto.

Professor J. H. Robinson, of Columbia University, has in the press of Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons a volume on Petrarch, containing a selection from his correspondence with Boccaccio and other friends, translated and

annotated in such a manner as to illustrate the beginnings of the Renaissance.

In commemoration of the fourth centenary of the martyrdom of Savonarola, Professor Pasquale Villari and Professor Casanova have published a volume of selected pages from Savonarola's sermons and writings, together with extracts from inedited contemporary documents throwing light upon his career. The volume is entitled: *Scelta di Prediche e Scritti, con nuovi Documenti intorno alla sua Vita*, and is published in Florence by Sansoni.

In a pamphlet of 79 pages entitled *Zur Beurteilung Savonarolas; Kritische Streifzüge* (Freiburg i. B., Herder) Dr. Ludwig Pastor defends the positions he took in his *Geschichte der Päpste* against the criticisms of Commer, Procter, Ferretti and Luotto. The pamphlet has been translated into Italian. Pastor's side in the controversy has been taken by Brüll in the April number of *Der Katholik*, and by Michael in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, XXII. 2. A more moderate Catholic view is taken by Schnitzer in the *Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland*, CXXI. 7-11.

The second section of Mr. Robert Proctor's *Index to the Early Printed Books of the British Museum* deals exclusively with Italy, and contains nearly 4,200 entries, against 3,200 in the first section, which deals with Germany.

An edition of the correspondence of Murat, *Carteggio di Gioacchino Murat*, will shortly be published by Roux and Co., of Turin.

The Milanese committee for the Museo del Risorgimento Nazionale, in co-operation with the municipal government of Milan, have commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the Five Days by the publication of a *Bibliografia Storica delle Cinque Giornate del Marzo 1848* (Milan, Giacomo Agnelli, pp. 275) edited by Signor Antonio Vismara. It takes notice of books, articles, bulletins, manifestos, circulars, inscriptions, pieces of music, etc.

The autobiography of General Enrico della Rocca, mentioned in these pages in an earlier issue, has been put into English in an abridged translation by Mrs. Janet Ross, and is to be published in London by T. Fisher Unwin.

Messrs. Small, Maynard and Company, of Boston, have published a volume on the *Spanish Revolution, 1868-1875*, by Hon. Edward Henry Strobel, the newly elected professor of international law in Harvard University, who was for some years a secretary of the United States legation at Madrid.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Pometti, *Per la Storia della Marina Italiana* (Rivista Marittima, March-April); Desdevises du Dezert, *La Marine Espagnole pendant la Campagne de Trafalgar* (Revue des Pyrénées, 1898, 1 and 2).

## GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND.

The principal official German historical publications of the past quarter have been Part IV. of Vol. XIII. of the *Auctores Antiquissimi* (M. H. G.) finishing Mommsen's edition of the minor chronicles of the fourth-seventh centuries; and a second *Lieferung* (1433-1437) of Vol. II. of the *Urkunden Kaiser Sigmunds* (*Regesta Imperii* XI.), edited by Dr. Wilhelm Altmann.

At the last general meeting of the board of directors of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* it was announced that the following were in press: *Liber Pontificalis* I., ed. Th. Mommsen; *Monumenta Erphesfurtensia saec. XII., XIII., XIV.*, ed. Holder-Egger; *Deutsche Chroniken*, Bd. III., ed. Strauch; *Diplomata Henrici II.*; *Registrum Gregorii II.*; *Epistolae* V.; *Necrologia Germaniae* II.; *Poetae Latini* IV. The following are nearly ready for the press; *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum* IV., ed. Krusch; *Leges Visigothorum*, ed. Zeumer; *Constitutiones Regum et Imperatorum* III., ed. Schwalm. Professor Seemüller of Innsbruck was entrusted with the editing of the Austrian chronicles, Dr. Meyer of Göttingen with the collecting of historical songs and "sayings," Dr. Werminhoff with the collecting of material on the Carolingian synods, and Professor Tangl with a similar task in relation to the judicial documents of the Franks and Lombards.

Dr. G. von Below makes Lamprecht's methods the subject of a long article, *Die neue historische Methode*, in the *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXI. 2. W. Oncken deals with the same much-debated theme in a pamphlet called *Lamprecht's Vertheidigung* (Berlin, E. Brückmann, pp. 48). Still another contribution to the discussion is Dr. Hermann Barge's *Entwicklung der geschichtswissenschaftlichen Anschauungen in Deutschland* (Leipzig, Dieterich, pp. 36).

Professors H. E. von Holst and B. S. Terry, of the University of Chicago, are preparing a *Brief German History*, for use in schools and colleges.

At the twenty-eighth annual meeting of the Hansischer Geschichtsverein, which took place at Einbeck on May 31 and June 1, it was announced that during the coming year the association expected to publish three volumes: Vol. VI. of the third series of the *Hanserecesse*, edited by D. Schäfer, and extending to 1516; Vol. V. of the first series of the *Hansisches Urkundenbuch*, edited by K. Kunze, and extending to 1414; and Vol. I. (1451-1463) of the second series of the latter, edited by W. Stein.

Through the house of B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, Dr. Erich Brandenburg, *privatdozent* in the university of that town, publishes the first volume of an important work on *Moritz von Sachsen*. This volume (pp. 558) extends to the Capitulation of Wittenberg (1547).

A manual recently issued, of which many readers may be glad to know, is Dr. Wilhelm Altmann's *Ausgewählte Urkunden zur deutschen*

*Verfassungsgeschichte seit 1806*, in two volumes of small cost (Berlin, R. Gaertner, pp. 312, 213).

The semi-centennial commemoration of the revolutionary days of 1848 has elicited an illustrated history by Hans Blum, *Die deutsche Revolution, 1848-50* (Leipzig, Diederichs); an article by Max Lenz in the *Preussische Jahrbücher* for March; one by Erich Marcks in *Velhagen and Klasing's Monatshefte*, XXI. 2; one by A. Buchholz on the contemporary historical writings on the event, in the *Deutsche Rundschau* for March; an article by Karl Frenzel in the same number, and one by Karl Biedermann in *Nord und Süd* for January. The last two are by writers who were eye-witnesses and in a sense participants.

In the series of "Heroes of the Nations," Mr. J. W. Headlam, of King's College, Cambridge, who has already written a history of modern Germany, issues a volume on *Bismarck and the New German Empire*, upon which he had been engaged for four years before Bismarck's death.

One of the most interesting and important of recent brief contributions to the knowledge of Bismarck is *Persönliche Erinnerungen an den Fürsten Bismarck*, by Christoph von Tiedemann, formerly a principal official of the imperial chancery (Leipzig, Hirzel, pp. 52).

In the *Nationalzeitung* of May 22 and 27, June 1 and 3, Dr. Tempel published characteristic and important portions of the correspondence of Duke Ernst of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha with King William, the Crown Prince and Mensdorff in the spring of 1866. These are now reprinted: *Herzog Ernst von Koburg und das Jahr 1866* (Berlin, H. Paetel, pp. 72).

A documentary publication of great magnitude, supported by the Austrian government, has lately been planned. It is to bear the general title of *Akten und Korrespondenzen zur neueren (vorzugsweise politischen) Geschichte Oesterreichs*, and is to consist of four series, relating respectively to the correspondence of sovereigns, to that of statesmen, to the reports of foreign envoys, and to treaties.

A co-operative history of Switzerland in the most modern times, *Die Schweiz im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, to be published by Schmid and Franke of Berne and F. Payot of Lausanne, and to be completed in three volumes, is in course of preparation by a number of Swiss historical writers, under the editorial supervision of Professor Paul Seippel of the Federal Polytechnicum at Zurich.

The *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de Genève*, Tome II., livr. 1, contains the text of a charter for the founding of a university, given between 1418 and 1422 by Pope Martin V. to Jean de Rochetaillée, patriarch of Constantinople, commendatory bishop of Geneva,—a document discovered by Professor Charles Borgeaud in his official researches for the history of the University of Geneva; also an interesting account of the cantonal archives from 1814 to the present time, by the present archivist, M. Louis Dufour-Vernes.

## NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM.

Professor P. J. Blok's *History of the Dutch People*, of which the original has been reviewed by us (II. 122) has been translated into English by Professor O. A. Bierstadt and Miss Ruth Putnam; the first volume of the translation will shortly be published by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Dr. Felix Rachfahl's *Margaretha von Parma, Statthalterin der Niederlande (1559-1567)*, the fifth volume in the *Historische Bibliothek* published by the editors of the *Historische Zeitschrift* (Munich, R. Oldenbourg, pp. 276) is a careful study, partly based on materials drawn from the archives at Brussels, and preliminary to a larger work on the earlier period of the revolt of the Netherlands.

The Royal Historical Commission of Belgium has in press the third volume of the cartulary of St. Lambert of Liège; Mr. Gilliodts van Severen's eleventh volume on the political relations between the Low Countries and England; the cartulary of the Van Artevelde, ed. de Pauw; and the cartulary of St. Hubert, ed. Kurth. M. Henri Pirenne will edit for the Commission a collection of sources relating to the history of the woolen industry in Flanders.

## NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE.

A German translation, *Geschichte der isländischen Geographie* (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner) makes accessible Th. Thoroddsen's treatise on the geography of Iceland and its history.

The *Recueil d' Actes Internationaux de l' Empire Ottoman*, by Gabriel Effendi Norodounghian, is intended to give summaries of all treaties of Turkey with other powers, full texts of those which are important, and references to, or texts of, such state papers as are especially adapted to illustrate them. The first volume (Paris, Leipzig, Neufchatel, pp. 412) contains treaties from 1300 to 1789.

Vol. X. (XXIX.) of the Rumanian Academy's *Documente privitoare la Istoria Românilor*, edited by Dr. Neculai Jorga (pp. 694), is chiefly occupied with the reports of the Prussian consuls in Jassy and Bucharest in the period from 1763 to 1844, interesting with respect to Rumanian history and the relations of the principalities to Prussia.

## AMERICA.

The autumn list of Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin and Co. includes four new volumes in the American Statesmen Series: Chief Justice Chase, by Professor Hart, of Harvard; Sumner, by Mr. Moorfield Storey; Thaddeus Stevens, by Hon. Samuel W. McCall; and Charles Francis Adams, by his son of the same name. A volume on *John Adams, the Statesman of the American Revolution*, by Judge Mellen Chamberlain, is at the same time announced, and the first volume (1752-1761) of *Letters to George Washington*, mostly hitherto unpublished, edited by Mr. S. M. Hamilton of the Department of State.



No. 6 in the sixteenth series of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies* consists of a monograph on Anti-Slavery Leaders in North Carolina, by Professor John S. Bassett, of Trinity College. Nos. 7-9 consist of an interesting and valuable monograph on the life and administration of Sir Robert Eden, the last proprietary governor of Maryland, by Dr. Bernard C. Steiner (pp. 142).

No. IX. in the series of *Papers from the Historical Seminary of Brown University* is a paper on the Government of Federal Territories in Europe, by Dr. E. C. Burnett, instructor in that institution; No. X. will be a monograph on the Council of Censors in Pennsylvania and Vermont, by Mr. Lewis H. Meader.

The late Mr. William S. Baker fortunately completed before his death his chronological itinerary and record of Washington's private and official life from 1784 to 1799, which has now been printed (Philadelphia, Lipincott) under the title *Washington after the Revolution*.

Rev. J. L. Seward has nearly ready for the press a history of the town of Sullivan, New Hampshire.

Nos. 87 and 88 of the *Old South Leaflets* present that portion of Morton's *New English Canaan* which deals with the manners and customs of the Indians, and the pages of Hubbard's *Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians* which describe the beginning and the ending of King Philip's War.

Under the title *Pictures of Rhode Island in the Past*, Miss Gertrude S. Kimball, author of a brief account of the East India trade of Providence, has prepared a series of extracts from old writers—travellers and others—describing Rhode Island, Providence or Newport, as they saw them in colonial or later times; the extracts are supplied with explanatory introductions and notes, and the volume is to be published by Messrs. Preston and Rounds of Providence.

The same firm also announce a life of *Esek Hopkins, Commander-in-Chief of the Continental Navy 1775 to 1778*, by Mr. Edward Field; the edition is limited.

The diary of the Rev. James MacSparran, who was one of the earliest rectors of St. Paul's Church in Narragansett, is about to be printed by Mr. Daniel Berkeley Updike at the Merrymount Press. The diary, which has for some time been possessed by the diocese of Rhode Island, extends from the year 1743 to 1751.

Yale University intends, as a part of the commemoration of its two-hundredth anniversary, to print in a series of volumes the *Diary* of President Stiles, well known to be rich in items of interest to the student of New England history. It is proposed to print the diary substantially in full, with illustrative notes from his other manuscripts; Dr. Franklin B. Dexter will be the editor.

The Connecticut Historical Society has received some 160 volumes

of New York, Washington, Richmond and Hartford newspapers of the period 1820-1860.

The *Bulletins* of the New York Public Library from May to September continue the calendar of the Emmet Collection relating to the signers of the Declaration of Independence. In addition they print the texts of an interesting letter of Jefferson, 1766, giving an account of the Maryland Assembly (May), bits of the records of the Confederate attorneys-general and a letter of Samuel Adams on the Boston Port Bill (June), a letter of James Sullivan, 1796, on the Northeast Boundary (July), the Massachusetts proposals of 1773 for colonial committees of correspondence (August), and a letter of McKean to Caesar Rodney (September). The June number completes the calendar of Washington's copy-press letters possessed by the library, with an index and a list affording comparison with those possessed by the Department of State. The July number has a list of publications on New York affairs under Governor Cosby, 1732-1736, and a catalogue of the library's pamphlets on the French Revolution.

The Astor Library has lately been enriched by the presentation of a collection of volumes and pamphlets on the South Sea Bubble so extensive as to number 421 separate items.

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons have just issued the first volume of the elaborate history of Trinity Church, New York City, a sumptuous book provided for by vote of the corporation, and edited by Dr. Morgan Dix, the rector of the church. The whole work will consist of three volumes.

Moses King of New York has lately issued a *Handbook of the Courts and Judges of New York City, their History and Functions, with Notes and Reminiscences of Judges and Lawyers*, by A. Oakey Hall.

The July number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains an interesting body of extracts from the letter-book of Captain Johann Heinrichs, of the Hessian Jäger Corps, 1778-1780, the manuscript of which has lately been acquired by the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. Mr. H. M. Jenkins's account of the family of William Penn is continued, as also the orderly-book of the Pennsylvania State Regiment of Foot.

The Colonial Society of Pennsylvania have carried out the intention of which we have spoken in a former issue by publishing a first volume of their reprint of the *American Weekly Mercury*, beginning in 1719. The facsimile has been prepared under the care of Mr. Julius F. Sachse, and is accompanied by an elaborate index. The work will be carried forward at the rate of two volumes a year. The address of the committee of publication is 1208 Betz Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Board of Publication of the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America has caused the publication, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, of a *Documentary History* of that ministerium,

containing the proceedings of its annual conventions from 1748 to 1821, carefully transcribed, translated and annotated, with indexes of subjects, of ministers, of lay delegates' names, and of place-names.

Professor Oscar Kuhns, of Wesleyan University, has nearly finished a work on the Pennsylvania Germans, in which he will trace the history of their life in Germany, their emigration, their settlement in Pennsylvania and their religious and social development in subsequent times.

The July number of the *Publications of the Southern History Association* has for its most important contents an article on Christopher Gadsden, by Mr. E. I. Renick, and one by Mr. B. W. Arnold on Virginia women in the Civil War. The Society intends to publish a much-needed index to Bishop Meade's *Old Churches, Ministers and Families of Virginia*. Subscriptions may be sent to the secretary, Dr. Colyer Meriwether, P. O. Box 665, Washington, D. C.

The July number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* contains interesting extracts from the Carter papers, from the Journal of John Barnwell, from the letters of William Fitzhugh, and from the letters of Lafayette to Governor Jefferson in 1781.

In the *Lower Norfolk County Virginia Antiquary*, No. 2, Part 3, the most important new matter relates to church affairs in 1649 and 1650. Matter relating to the burning of Norfolk by the Americans in 1776 and to Grace Sherwood the witch is reprinted from other places. There is a list of harp and piano owners in Portsmouth (Va.) in 1855, taken from the report of a commissioner of revenue.

Professor Charles Lee Raper has published in book-form a series of articles on *The Church and Private Schools of North Carolina* (Greensborough, J. J. Stone, pp. 245), which he has been contributing to a local college paper.

A serious effort is being made to revive interest in the Alabama Historical Society. Its officers intend to issue, as soon as possible, the first volume of its *Transactions*, embracing papers read at various times since its organization in 1850, and before long a second volume containing the papers read at the annual meeting of June 21, 1898. Appeal is made for subscriptions and other aid. The secretary, Mr. T. M. Owen, announces a history of Jefferson County, Alabama, 1814-1898, to be published by him at Carrollton.

The July number of the *Quarterly* of the Texas State Historical Association contains an interesting sketch of the life of Judge O. M. Roberts, late president of the society, an article on the old fort at Anahuac, by Adèle B. Looscan, and the beginning of a sketch of the judicial history of Texas, by Hon. John C. Townes. The books and manuscripts on Texan history collected by Judge Roberts have been bequeathed by him to the State University.

The fortunes of the Scioto Company and of the Société des Vingt-Quatre are studied, from the papers of M. du Val d'Epréménail, in the *Revue de Paris* of May 15, by M. Henri Carré.

The *Annals of Iowa*, in its double number for April-July, contains a history of Fort Des Moines, a series of reminiscences of Gen. James Parrott, and an account of the battle of Pleasant Hill by three Iowa officers. The General Assembly has made an appropriation for the purchase of a suitable site for an imposing historical building for the state.

Col. Henry Inman, U. S. A., whose *Old Santa Fe Trail* was recently reviewed in this journal, has brought out another book of a similar character on *The Great Salt Lake Trail* (Macmillan), in which he has been assisted by Col. W. F. Cody, better known as "Buffalo Bill."

The government printing office has issued a descriptive list entitled *Alaska and the Northwest Part of North America, 1588-1898: Maps in the Library of Congress* (pp. 101), by Mr. P. Lee Phillips, superintendent of maps and charts in that library.

Mr. A. P. C. Griffin, assistant librarian of Congress, has prepared a list of books and articles relating to Hawaii, similar to the Cuban list heretofore mentioned in these pages (Government Printing Office).

Mr. Beckles Willson has nearly ready for publication a history of the Hudson Bay Company, entitled *Prince Rupert, His Land and His Company during Two Centuries*. The book, though popular in tone, is based upon studies of the original sources, and in some cases of archive material hitherto inaccessible.

The late Don José Fernando Ramirez left a manuscript of *Adiciones y Correcciones* to Beristain y Souza's *Bibliotheca Hispano-Americana*. These have now been printed (Mexico, Victoriano Agüeros, pp. xlvii, 662), with a life of Ramirez by D. Luis Gonzalez Obregon.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: T. K. Urdahl, *The Relation of the Colonial Fee-System to Political Liberty* (*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, July); C. K. Adams, *Some Neglected Aspects of the Revolutionary War* (*Atlantic*, August); A. B. Hart, *The Experience of the United States in Foreign Military Expeditions* (*Harper's Magazine*, September); J. M. Morgan, *The Confederacy's Only Foreign War* (*Century*, August); J. T. Mason, *The Last of the Confederate Cruisers* (*Century*, August); F. Bancroft, *Seward's Ideas of Territorial Expansion* (*North American Review*, July).

